

CHURCH HISTORY

Edited by J. H. NICHOLS and F. A. NORWOOD
with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON (*Divinity School,
Yale University*)

R. PIERCE BEAVER (*Divinity School,
University of Chicago*)

ROBERT GRANT (*Divinity School,
University of Chicago*)

WINTHROP S. HUDSON (*Colgate-
Rochester Divinity School*)

SIDNEY E. MEAD (*Divinity School,
University of Chicago*)

RAY C. PETRY (*Divinity School, Duke
University*)

MATTHEW SPINKA (*Hartford Theo-
logical Seminary*)

WILHELM PAUCK (*Union Theological
Seminary*)

JOHN DILLENBERGER (*Divinity School,
Harvard University*)

EDWARD A. DOWEY, JR. (*McCormick
Theological Seminary*)

VOL. XXV

SEPTEMBER, 1956

No. 3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE IMPORTANCE OF JACQUES SAURIN IN THE HISTORY OF CASUISTRY AND THE ENLIGHTENMENT

George L. Mosse 195

DOCTRINE AND FELLOWSHIP: WILLIAM CHANNING GANNETT AND THE UNITARIAN CREEDAL ISSUE

William H. Pease 210

THE SOCIAL GOSPEL AND THE TRUST-BUSTERS

Robert R. Roberts 239

SURVEYS OF RECENT LITERATURE 258

BRITISH CHURCH HISTORY Winthrop S. Hudson

EASTERN ORTHODOX HISTORY Matthew Spinka

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS 265

CONTENTS

BOOK REVIEWS

282

C. H. COOK: *The English Mediaeval Parish Church* Otto G. von Simson

DOROTHY WHITELOCK, ed.: *English Historical Documents c. 500-1042*
..... Allen Cabaniss

MARTIN JARRETT-KERR: *Studies in Literature and Belief*
..... Nathan A. Scott, Jr.

DOM DAVID KNOWLES: *The Religious Orders in England. Volume*
II: The End of the Middle Ages Joseph H. Dahmus

Autobiography of Peter Cartwright Frederick A. Norwood

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

288

THE IMPORTANCE OF JACQUES SAURIN IN THE HISTORY OF CASUISTRY AND THE ENLIGHTENMENT

GEORGE L. MOSSE, *University of Wisconsin*

I

The purpose of this paper is to examine several aspects of the relationship between Christianity and the rise of the new rationalistic spirit of the eighteenth century. It is in this connection that we intend to examine the thought of the French Huguenot preacher Jacques Saurin (1677-1730). Historians have held that the two leading ideas of that century, Nature and Reason, derive their meaning from the natural sciences.¹ Such a point of view tends to ignore the greater realism towards nature and politics which developed within the Christian theological framework itself. From the sixteenth century on, we find orthodox theologians emphasizing the need for dealing with the world on its own terms.² It was not so much the new sciences but rather the conflicts of the Reformation which brought out this increasingly rational attitude on the part of both Protestant and Catholic theologians. This development went on side by side with that secularized idea of reason which is of specific scientific inspiration. The means which theologians used to make room for a greater realism in their Christian framework of thought was casuistic divinity.

The importance of such casuistry for the development of Western thought is even today imperfectly understood. The reason for this may lie in the controversies of the Reformation era when accusations of casuistry became one of the favored instruments of Protestant polemics against Catholicism. In reality, casuistry was practiced by both sides, as some contemporaries themselves realized,³ for it meant nothing more than the stretching of the received framework of ethics to make room for new realities. Nor was this casuistry unscriptural. The German historian Wilhelm Dilthey was much mistaken when he wrote that the principles contained in the Bible could not lead towards a necessary reordering of society and that, as a consequence of this insufficiency, men turned to secular thought.⁴ Dilthey saw an unbridgeable gulf between the biblical ideal of a society based upon brotherly love, community of goods, and a theocratic order on the one hand and the realities of life on the other.⁵ For the casuists, such contradictions never existed. The Bible was to them not such a simplistic thing, nor was the Christian framework of life something to be jettisoned so easily. Their efforts were directed instead towards bringing this framework into constant contact with reality.

Studying this casuistic thought must lead one to revise the commonly accepted notion that the greater realism in man's approach to life which came about in the early modern period was inexorably connected with the emergence of secular attitudes; that it progressed in the same ratio as men threw off either their biblical fundamentalism or their traditional religious framework of thought. The work of Jacques Saurin can well serve to illustrate the falseness of such a general assertion. He demonstrates clearly the rise of rationalistic attitudes within an orthodox religious framework, for the Calvinist Saurin was bitterly opposed to the development of the rational theology of the Enlightenment.

Beyond this, Saurin can serve to illustrate one additional point of great importance. Despite the fact that this orthodox Calvinist theologian opposed rational theology, his very casuistry gave aid and comfort to these enemies of traditional religion. A rational theologian like Jean LeClerc could use Saurin's casuistic ideas to his own advantage. The danger in the casuistic stretching of the Christian framework of ethics was that it might eventually lead to the emasculating of Christian orthodoxy itself. Saurin, then, is important not only for the nature of his casuistry, but also for showing how such casuistry could, in other hands, further the main stream of the religious thought of the Enlightenment. Here may well be another (albeit an involuntary) link between orthodox Christianity and the rise of the new rationalistic spirit in the West. In this light the controversy which raged around Saurin's work while showing us the impact of such casuistry upon the orthodox Calvinist Huguenot churches of Holland, also foreshadows the ultimate undermining of the orthodox point of view.

II

In the middle of the last century, one French Protestant historian, writing about the oratory of Jacques Saurin was to recall "the elevated and audacious flight of the eagle of Meaux."⁶ Others saw in him a coreligionist who rivaled, and even surpassed, the eloquence of the great Catholic Bishop Bossuet himself.⁷ There is little doubt that among the Huguenot exiles he played a leading role. His brilliant oratory was not destined for his compatriots alone, for when, after a brief sojourn in London, he reached The Hague, a special post was created for him. As extraordinary minister to the Dutch nobility, he numbered in his audiences some of the Republic's leading statesmen.

Saurin's brilliant career, however, was to be clouded by the controversy that surrounded his last years. The story is told how, on visiting his deathbed, several of his fellow ministers urged this eminent divine to repent before it was too late, and how Saurin with his

dying breath, denied the heretical opinions which were imputed to him.⁸ But it is precisely this controversy, however much grief it may have caused Saurin, which did make him a figure of importance beyond his oratorical skill. It was his *Dissertation sur les Mensonges*, as a part of the larger *Discours Historique* (1728), which led to the proceedings against Saurin.

This *Dissertation* is concerned with the permissibility of lying. Saurin's attitude toward the Christian use of falsehood provides a good touchstone for that rationalism which expresses itself in the casuistic attitude toward life's realities. A fellow divine, from across the channel, summed up one viewpoint on this question when he wrote that "The first murderer of all mankind, was also the first *lyer*; two horrible vices, and alike bloody. For a man had better be murdered then belied, have his person slain, then his fame."⁹ But here is an obvious contrast between ideal and reality. As Saurin himself put it: If lying were always a crime, society could not exist—and a dishonest scoundrel could abuse a good man.¹⁰ The fundamental problem involved in arriving at a Christian point of view towards falsehood had been well stated by Machiavelli, *The Prince*, Chapter 15: "a man who wants only to do good must perish among so many men who are evil." However, Saurin did not turn to Machiavelli for an answer to this problem but instead found guidance in the Word of God. He noticed that there were in the Bible certain holy personages who broke the law of truth and who, far from being punished for this offence, merited praise instead.¹¹

Saurin first sought to find an explanation for such acts in his Calvinism. No one is perfect; even the most eminent saints have their "crackings," and in emulating them it must be remembered that they have great virtues which obscure their faults.¹² This analysis is followed by most Calvinistically inclined theologians. Yet neither for them, nor for Saurin, could such a human explanation suffice.¹³ The reason for this is not far to seek. There are moments in Scripture when God Himself commands acts of deceiving which come perilously close to the sanctioning of a lie.

There is, for example, Rahab, who hid the spies of Israel and lied to the king's messengers about it. Saurin first deals with those theologians who have held that Rahab's good intentions must be distinguished from the way in which she carried out her task, that God praised only her design and not her lying. It was by separating the "intention" from the "deed" that previous casuists had tried to account for God's part in such actions. Saurin rejects such a division.¹⁴ It would have been useless for Rahab to shelter the spies if she had not intended to protect them by lying. The means and the ends cannot be separated in this case, and therefore God's praise must apply

to both.¹⁵ The same argument holds good for the Egyptian midwives.¹⁶ It will be remembered that they refused to deliver the children of the Israelites to the Pharaoh and denied having them in their custody.

If we contrast Saurin's comments on the dissembling of the midwives with previous interpretations of their action, it will become clear how far Saurin has gone in sanctioning the use of such deception. The Geneva Bible, whose notes were written under Calvin's guidance, passes this judgment upon them: "their disobedience was lawful, but their dissembling evil."¹⁷ William Perkins, writing toward the end of the sixteenth century, modified this interpretation. "The works which they did were excellent works of mercy, and therefore to be allowed: and the doers failed only in the manner of performing them."¹⁸ This casuist makes a distinction between the midwives' "Intention," which is all-important, and the outward deed, which is not. But for Saurin, the midwives' dissembling was a good, and not an evil, while their performance, far from being a failure, was praised by God.

The specific biblical interpretation which Saurin's enemies were to attack did not directly concern his judgment of Rahab's actions or those of the Egyptian midwives, but his comments upon Samuel's mission to Bethlehem. Here he showed the same consequentness in analyzing God's attitude towards lying. In the *Discourse*, which precedes the *Dissertation*, he deals for the first time with God's command to Samuel. Samuel, we might recall, was afraid to go to Bethlehem with the announced purpose of anointing Saul to be king. God advised him to take a young cow into Bethlehem and, disguising his real intentions, proclaim that he had merely come to make a sacrifice. Here, Saurin tells us, it cannot be said that even the best men lack perfection for we are confronted with a direct command from God. "It is the God of truth who speaks and by his command Samuel uses his disguise."¹⁹ In the actual discourse on lying, he comes back to this episode: God's goal was to inspire Samuel to error.²⁰

This puts a most serious construction on the biblical passage. St. Augustine had held that it was, on occasion, justifiable to withhold the truth but that it was never justifiable to inspire a fellow man to error. For Saurin, however, this is precisely what God had done to Samuel. He concludes that, for all this, Samuel's lie is not criminal, because it was commanded by God.²¹ Yet he does not stop there, but brings God's example down to earth. It is possible, he tells us, that if God found himself in human circumstances and could not defend his happiness against evil men except by using a lie, that he might do so. He adds at once, however, that God is not human but of sovereign happiness, and that presumably therefore such an occasion would never arise.²² Despite this qualification, it is clear that Saurin's

interpretation of the Samuel passage has led him to justify not merely the withholding of truth but also the throwing of a fellow man into error. In another passage, he explicitly asks if it is legal to do so and answers his question in the affirmative, using as an additional example the story of St. Anathasius, who deliberately misled his pursuers.²³ What then is Jacques Saurin's definition of truthfulness?

Truth is conceived as a pact between two persons. However, if one person abuses this agreement and uses the other's truthfulness in order to hurt him, the man offended against is no longer bound by this pact.²⁴ This example is then broadened to apply to the political realm. Two politicians are in conference and the execution of a treaty upon which the happiness of the nation is at stake. If one politician is sincere and the other uses words to hide his designs, then the sincere statesman is obliged to imitate the behavior of his insincere opposite in order to frustrate the latter's evil designs.²⁵ Does this then mean that by using these insincere methods the good politician can no longer qualify as a Christian statesman?

On the contrary, it is his duty as a Christian to use such devious means for the sake of his nation whose happiness is at stake.²⁶ Saurin, in accord with his predecessors, gives additional proof. A good patriot must be a man of learning and of dexterity in negotiation: he must know innocent feigning and prudent circumspection.²⁷ But he can only really know all these things and be a good patriot if he is also a good Christian and follows the goals which Divinity has set.²⁸ Here, as with the casuists of the previous century, God becomes the master politician: the "God of truth" teaches political maneuvering to those who do His work.²⁹ The "innocence" of the feigning in which the politician can indulge is further defined by Saurin's view on lying as it finally emerges from the totality of his thought.

Saurin did not license indiscriminate lying. There is one lie which is a criminal lie, namely the denial of the religion of Jesus Christ.³⁰ It is the fact that, apart from this *caveat*, he gives to lying so much scope which introduces a definite note of realism into his theology. For it is not only a negative withholding of the truth which is approved, though Saurin talks about that as well, but, as we saw, the more positive act of lying also. What then of St. Paul's injunction forbidding men to do evil in order that good may come of it? Saurin answers this also. It is up to the individual to prove that his use of the lie is evil, and he must not prejudge the case.³¹ To sum it up in Saurin's own terms: the general laws of Christianity forbidding lies have their limitations. They must be judged by the nature of things and by other passages from Scripture. And so Saurin did judge them.

When writing the *Dissertation*, Saurin cast these opinions in the guise of a historical argument. The weight is none the less al-

ways put upon that side which permits the kind of lying discussed above. It was only after the ensuing controversy that he added a final paragraph to the *Dissertation*. Here he contended that the arguments for and against the use of a lie were so well balanced that one must have tolerance for both sides of the question.³² Saurin, unlike his adversaries, seems to have been aware of the complexities of theological problems. In a letter he lamented the "puerile" theology of Holland where one must have reasonable and precise explanations on every subject.³³ The unsuccessful efforts of his enemies to commit Saurin to a precise opinion opposing all lying seems to validate these strictures against Dutch Calvinism. The fact that Saurin's whole argument was cast in this historical framework will have a bearing on the controversy itself and, further, upon those who saw in Saurin a man of the Enlightenment and who for this reason gave him their support.

In discussing the controversy in which Saurin became involved, it is worth noting at the outset that he did have important support against those who attacked his casuistry. Two churches, those of Arnhem and Breda, had approved the *Dissertation* even before it was printed,³⁴ and the church of The Hague was to sympathize with its most popular preacher. Here itself is a sign that this kind of thought was becoming recognized in respectable Calvinist circles, among orthodox churches which were free from Arminianism. Nor is it without significance that Saurin's ideas on Christian statesmanship were never under attack. But most important in this respect is the course and the result of the controversy itself.

The dispute was started by a fellow Huguenot exile, Armand de la Chapelle, and it was directed at Saurin's interpretation of God's command to Samuel. La Chapelle's contention was obvious: that by making God out as having commanded a lie, Saurin had attacked the perfection of God Himself. Moreover, Saurin had introduced an element of indecision where divine perfection was concerned.

The Church of Utrecht gave official approval to La Chapelle's position. In the spring of 1730 at the Synod of Campen, this church, jointly with the Church of Gouda, asked that Saurin's work be discussed and investigated. The ministers and elders of Utrecht were afraid that the public might think of their church as sanctioning the ideas put forward in the *Discourse* and the *Dissertation*, ideas built on ruinous foundations and fraught with annoying consequences for society and religion.³⁵ These accusations against Jacques Saurin were discussed in several synods, and finally referred to the synod meeting at The Hague in the summer of 1730. There they seem to have caused a bitter debate. One contemporary tells us of his refusal to write about the proceedings, as this might offend some people

still living,³⁷ while another blames the secretary of the synod for the tone of the debate: "son esprit n'est pas moins enflammé que son visage."³⁸ What gave the synod pause were two things. One was Saurin's popularity as a preacher and the other a catechism which Saurin had written earlier. It was this catechism which pointed to a way out of the controversy. In this work Saurin had followed an older line of thought. Lying was characterized as a most odious crime and, though it may be legal at times to withhold the truth, to tell a lie is forbidden on all occasions. Saurin's statement in the catechism, that men are more unhappy than voyagers in the hands of brigands if they are allowed to lie to each other, contrasts with his opinion in the *Dissertation* that if men do not occasionally lie they have no protection against scoundrels.³⁹ As the synod itself realized, the *Catechism* and the *Dissertation* were in many respects contradictory.⁴⁰

The synod, however, decided to believe Saurin's "good faith" in writing the *Catechism*,⁴¹ and to submit to him for signature a carefully worded retraction of that part of the *Dissertation* which hinged on the interpretation of Samuel's deceit. The key passage of this document asked Saurin to affirm that God can neither give an order in which there is a criminal lie, nor indeed an order in which there is contained any lie whatsoever.⁴² The synod was entitled to believe that Saurin would sign this document willingly, for he had made a declaration to the Church of The Hague which seemed to embody the same thoughts.⁴³ There Saurin stated that he stood by the passages in the *Catechism* which dealt with God's perfection and His truthfulness. The *Dissertation* and the *Discourse* were not meant to teach a different doctrine. The Hague deputies to the synod were ready to make do with this statement.⁴⁴ For the other deputies, however, it was not specific enough, especially in clarifying the relationship between lying and the holiness of the Supreme Being.⁴⁵ Therefore they drew up this declaration which they now submitted for his signature.

It would have been better for the deputies' cause if they had been content with The Hague statement. By trying to enforce on Saurin that very preciseness which he so lamented, the deputies achieved nothing but a final declaration which in its content repudiated both their own wish for retraction, as well as the declaration actually made to the Hague Church. For, far from seeing in the statement now before him a capturing of the spirit of the earlier document, Saurin refused to sign without making some changes. In consternation, the synod yielded to his wishes.

In reality, Saurin seems to have made only one change, but this was a highly significant one. He shortened the passage described above

to state the obvious contention that God Himself could never have given an order which contained a criminal lie. That is, a lie which touched the Christian faith itself.⁴⁷ Nothing was said about God's commanding the telling of lies such as Samuel's, which were not criminal. Another printed version of the retraction makes it a still more harmless document by omitting even any reference whatever to the *Catechism*.⁴⁸ Saurin had conceded nothing. The synod, however, accepted Saurin's declaration with great "happiness" in the hope of putting an end to the dispute.⁴⁹ It was not only the general acceptance of Saurin's "good faith" which had speeded the end of the proceedings against him. The synod feared the intervention of the secular authorities, always a possibility in the strained relationship which prevailed between the church and the state in Holland.⁵⁰ It was Saurin himself who seems to have hastened the acceptance of his final declaration by threatening to give cognizance of the actions against him to the Estates General.⁵¹ This danger was avoided by the synod.

However, the hopes of ending the controversy itself in so satisfactory a manner were soon dashed. To Saurin's own embarrassment, there now appeared several works in his defense—books which spelled out with some clarity the consequences of the thought contained in the *Dissertation*. Thus M. Antoine de Beaumarchais, a former Catholic priest, held that nothing can limit God in anything He wants to command. As sovereign master of the universe, He can contradict to one person what He tells another, and make one man execute all sorts of designs against another human being.⁵² The most blunt and vituperative defense of Saurin came from the pen of Francis Bruys. To Bruys, the whole controversy was merely a dispute about words and it would, in his opinion, have been better if Saurin had omitted the word lie altogether. He should have used the term dissimulation, for this need not actually be opposed to the truth and can, indeed, contain a part of it.⁵³ What brought Bruys' book to public attention however, were his strictures upon La Chapelle, whom he blamed, not without reason, for having started all the fuss.

Under La Chapelle's influence, the churches of Walloon and Flanders went into action once more by lodging a complaint against Bruys' book, this time not with the synods, but with the Court of Holland.⁵⁴ A judicial decision about the permissibility of lying was now required. The court sided with La Chapelle, and praised his stand as a refutation of Saurin's contention that there are occasions in which one may lie without this being considered a crime. Finally, it condemned both Bruys' book as well as all criminal lies.⁵⁵ This decision put an end to the controversy itself. For one thing, Saurin had recently died, and for another, the contentious Bruys reconverted

to Catholicism from which he had only lately departed to join the Huguenots.⁵⁶

Only for La Chapelle himself did his victory have a bitter fruit. Once more the jealousies between State and Church were involved. The Court of Holland had praised the minister and now the full consistory took the first opportunity to assert its powers against the secular authorities by rebuking him for the harsh words he had said about Saurin. La Chapelle immediately made a special declaration to the effect that he did not intend to withdraw himself from ecclesiastical jurisdiction.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, he was suspended by the synod. It is typical, however, that despite this suspension he was maintained in his functions by the Estates General.⁵⁸ They had now entered the picture, something which had been avoided during the actual controversy with Saurin.

It was these facts which led to the eventual, posthumous, justification of Saurin himself. When in 1744 La Chapelle was reinstated by the synod, he in turn had to make a declaration repudiating his entire behavior towards Saurin ever since the beginning of the controversy.⁵⁹ The wheel had gone the full circle.

The course of this controversy can give us an insight into the attitude of Calvinism towards casuistry. La Chapelle's final victory in the court of Holland was more apparent than real. Church-state rivalry ultimately forced the synod, through La Chapelle, to repudiate the whole dispute. Moreover, Saurin from the start had the support of several churches, and his retraction, which conceded nothing, had been gratefully accepted by all the Dutch Huguenot churches. A circular letter sent by the ministers of Leyden to The Hague synod is of special interest in this connection. These ministers supported Saurin's stand and bolstered their argument in favor of the *Dissertation* in several ways. Firstly, the ideas put forward in the work were founded upon those of Reformed theologians. Saurin had indeed cited Hugo Grotius. This, however, in view of that writer's Arminianism, could not serve to impress orthodox ministers, and his colleagues at Leyden cited in addition the approval of the churches of Breda and Arnhem.⁶⁰ They contended that no Protestant confession of faith had ever dealt with the different points of view concerning the permissibility of lying. Even St. Augustine, who was opposed to the criminal lie, tells us that the opinions which he combatted had always gathered adherents throughout the centuries.⁶¹ This is surely a remarkable argument on the part of the ministers of Leyden. Finally, Saurin himself had stated that he spoke as a casuist.⁶²

This letter with its ambivalent attitude towards lying must make clear once again how great a leeway the good Christian possessed to counter those evil men and forces which confronted him, and how far

an acceptance of the realities of life had developed within the religious context. If we look at this thought as the Christian answer to Machiavelli's question of how a good man can survive among so many men who are evil, then it becomes apparent that the very broadness of the permissibility of lying transforms the good Christian into an effective politician capable of defending his interests.

III

There is, however, another argument given in the letter from the Leyden ministers which raises the problem of the relationship of this casuistry to the religious thought of the Enlightenment. Referring to Saurin's historical method of presentation in the *Dissertation*, the ministers ask: Should he retract something in which he takes no sides?⁶⁸ This element in Saurin's work is brought out fully in the review which Jean le Clerc wrote of the entire *Discours Historiques* in his *Bibliothèque*. Le Clerc, like Saurin, was a Huguenot and they had shared the same teachers.⁶⁴ But Le Clerc was an Arminian, a professor at the Arminian College in Amsterdam, and as one of his biographers put it—"his fight for reason accelerated the movements of the eighteenth century."⁶⁵ Indeed, Le Clerc was one of the group of "rational theologians" for whom reason dominated man's thought and action, and if faith was in conflict with reason, then it had to submit. This did not mean irreligion, as Le Clerc's attacks on Pierre Bayle show, but it meant a belief that faith and reason must necessarily coincide, for both share the same divine origin.⁶⁶ As a result of this rational theology, Le Clerc's own biblical commentaries tended to eliminate the validity of supernatural miracles, while Saurin, in contrast, went out of his way to defend them. Scripture was the work of fallible men whose accounts of events were filled with the superstitions of a primitive epoch.⁶⁷ Le Clerc's scriptural commentaries were condemned by the Walloon churches as Socinian, and in his youth he had to leave Geneva because of that same accusation. Even in the nineteenth century, Le Clerc was listed among famous Unitarians who had denied the Trinity.⁶⁸ In contrast, Saurin was orthodox in his teachings on the Trinity, predestination, and original sin.⁶⁹ It is surely significant that the casuistry of an orthodox theologian of Saurin's stamp could be used to further the ideas of a man whom Voltaire could praise and mention in the same breath with Newton.⁷⁰

For Le Clerc, Saurin had not written a theological or a moral work, but an examination of facts with critical remarks.⁷¹ To him, the whole of the *Discourse* is a quest for clarification, an attempt to distinguish what we know from what we do not know, lest we take a mass of uncertain knowledge for demonstrated truth. A reading of Saurin helps a man apply himself to those things in religion which he can understand, and to obey only those commands of God which

are clear.⁷² All those theological interpretations in which there exist two conflicting viewpoints must be ignored. It is a rational kind of religion which emerges from these reflections. What Saurin called tolerance towards both sides of the question, because both sides are argued by great men,⁷³ Le Clerc reads as "uncertain knowledge" which must, therefore, be ignored for its certainty cannot be demonstrated.

De Chauffépié, in his supplement to Bayle's dictionary, makes a similar point. In his account of the controversy, which is most favorable to Saurin, he quotes one writer as seeing in Saurin's indecision about lying a great aid to religion. If we examine religion with justice and find that there are not enough reasons for clearly determining a problem, then we must suspend judgment. Everything is susceptible to proof.⁷⁴ Saurin here becomes the great rationalist battling the forces of darkness in the shape of La Chapelle. Both Le Clerc and Chauffépié provide a link between traditional and rational religion. Both were Calvinist ministers and neither went as far as their younger contemporary, Hermann Reimarus, whose critical radicalism led him to deny revelation. Nevertheless, by their identification of faith and rational proof, they contributed towards the religious attitudes of the Enlightenment, and by their viewpoints on Saurin's work, they transformed him into a precursor of this movement.

It was not Saurin the preacher who could be so used. For him it was not reason, but the senses, which were the foundation of religion.⁷⁵ Even if the senses, reason, and revelation working together constitute what we mean by "knowledge," in those matters which concern religion, revelation gives us greater "light" than reason.⁷⁶ It was Saurin the casuist who seemed to condone such rationalism in his faith. It must be clearly understood that both Le Clerc and Chauffépié did transform Saurin. His method, as we saw above, did not in fact prevent him from stressing one side of his argument, and his request for tolerance of both views was written under the stress of controversy. To him there was, in the last resort, no such thing as uncertainty of knowledge in questions of religion. All injunctions of the Divine Law must always be observed, for did not Nehemiah uproot all that were opposed to it?⁷⁷

Divine Law was for Saurin a matter of interpreting the Bible. If my interpretation, he tells us, differs from the one I should have, it is possible that I am in error, but as long as I do not touch God's infallibility, this cannot be a fundamental error. It becomes this, however, if I am proved to be opposed to God and Revelation and still persist in my own views despite this. For then I put my own reason and wisdom above Revelation.⁷⁸ Reason must always be submitted to Scripture.⁷⁹ Obviously, here Saurin does not mean rational proof

of clarification but proof of supernatural religion. It is also clear, when comparing this passage with his retraction, that La Chapelle and his friends had not proved to him that his interpretation of the Samuel passage was in fact a fundamental error.

If Saurin's casuistry had a connection with the more rational ideas of Le Clerc and Chauffépié, it was in spite of the main currents of his thought. Yet this very connection raises the possibility of a relationship between casuistry and the Enlightenment, and this despite the contempt in which this movement tended to hold all casuistic thought.⁸⁰ Such a connection may lie partly in the casuistic method, but more wholly with the casuistic stretching of the Christian framework of ethics. The realm of uncertain religious knowledge was constantly being extended by the broadening of permissible actions, and we have seen what a large scope, within the Divine Law, Saurin gave to the telling of lies.

In his casuistry, Saurin also has established contact with the realism of life. After all, there was little in the way of lying and deceit that either the Christian statesman or the individual Christian might not do in order to counter an evil adversary.

Here Saurin seems less beset with doubts than many of his Protestant predecessors of an earlier age. This can be demonstrated through the example of an English divine who wrote exactly a century before the Hague synod had to come to terms with our problem. What receives emphasis in Daniel Dyke's *Mystery of Self-Deceiving* is the very fact that we must not plead the necessity of living in order to excuse deceptions, for had not Esau sold away heaven by using this pretence?⁸¹ Though God can command actions which are otherwise forbidden, such as the slaying of Isaac by Abraham,⁸² without such a direct order humans cannot plead that because the times are corrupt they must be corrupt also—and this without any fault on their own. Instead, "the more infections in the air, the stricter we must be in our diet."⁸³ The contradictions between this attitude and Saurin's greater rationalism stand out. As we saw, if God Himself were in a human situation, He might Himself have occasion to use deception. Saurin's Christian answer to the means a good man may use to keep afloat in an evil world is not far removed from the answer given to this problem by Machiavelli nearly two centuries before.

It should now be clear that Saurin shows the need for dealing with the world on its own terms and in so doing develops from within his theological framework of reference a greater realism towards the place of man on earth. Here is a rationalistic spirit which does not connect with the natural sciences. Moreover, the use made of his work has shown us a connection between this kind of casuistry, developing from within the thought of Calvinist orthodoxy, and the

Enlightenment itself. This suggests that the relationship between Christianity and the spirit of the Enlightenment cannot be discussed merely in terms of scientific influence, but has to take into account the theological developments of traditional Christianity.

1. I.e., John Herman Randall, *The Making of the Modern Mind* (New York, 1940) 255.
2. George L. Mosse, *The Holy Pretence, a Study in Christianity and Reason of State from William Perkins to John Winthrop* (Oxford, 1956).
3. I.e., William Ames, *Conscience with the Power and the Cases Thereof*, etc. (n.p., 1639), to the reader.
4. Wilhelm Dilthey, "Die Autonomie des Denkens, der Konstruktive Rationalismus und der Pantheistische Monismus nach ihrem Zusammenhang im 17. Jahrhundert," *Gesammelte Schriften* (Berlin und Leipzig, 1921), 268-269.
5. *Ibid.*, 268.
6. Charles Weiss, *History of the French Protestant Refugees* (New York, 1854), I, 70.
7. For such comparisons see E. A. Bert hauld, *J. Saurin et la prédication protestante* (Paris, 1875) as well as E. Melon, *Étude historique et critique sur Jacques Saurin* (Caen, 1858), who also call him the "Chrysostome du Protestantisme," 24; Emmanuel Meriot, *Essai sur la prédication de Saurin* (Montauban, 1872), makes similar comparisons. There are two lives of Saurin, both brief, and both concentrating on his preaching: J. P. Gaberel, *Jacques Saurin* (n.p., n.d.) and the more serious J. J. van Oosterzee, *Jacques Saurin* (Rotterdam, 1855). A. Vinet in his *Histoire de la prédication parmi les Réformés de France aux dix-septième siècle* (Paris, 1860) includes a chapter on Saurin, 597-711, and concludes that he had no ancestors or descendants in his eloquence, 597.
8. Francis Bruys, *Mémoires historiques, critiques, et littéraires* (Paris, 1751), I (hereafter *Mémoires*); J. J. van Oosterzee, *Jacques Saurin* (Rotterdam, 1855), 139-143.
9. Anthony Stafford, *Meditations and Resolutions, Moral, Divine, Political* (London, 1612), 8.
10. Jacques Saurin, "Dissertation sur le mensonge," *Discours historiques, critiques, théologiques, et moraux*, etc. (La Haye, 1730), IV, 340. (Hereafter *Dissertation*). It should be pointed out that Saurin's work is a part of the excellent holdings of 17th century theological works printed in Holland, available in the Tank Collection of the University of Wisconsin Library.
11. Saurin, "Discours XXXI," *Discours historiques, critiques, théologiques, . . .* (La Haye, 1730), IV, 317 (hereafter *Discours*).
12. *Ibid.*
13. *Ibid.* For a discussion of how some earlier casuists dealt with this problem, see George L. Mosse, "Puritan Political Thought and the 'Cases of Conscience,'" *Church History* (June, 1954), 109-119.
14. Saurin, *Dissertation*, 332; for precedents, see Mosse, "The Assimilation of Machiavelli in English Thought: the Casuistry of William Perkins and William Ames," *Huntington Library Quarterly* (August, 1954), 321 ff.
15. Saurin, *Dissertation*, 333.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *The Bible and Holy Scripture*, etc. (Geneva, 1560), Exodus, 1:19.
18. William Perkins, "A Direction for the Government of the Tongue," *The Works of M. William Perkins* (London, 1631), I, 443.
19. Saurin, *Discours*, 317.
20. Saurin, *Dissertation*, 335.
21. *Ibid.*, 336.
22. *Ibid.*, 343, 344.
23. *Ibid.*, 334, 335.
24. *Ibid.*, 328.
25. *Ibid.*, 329.
26. *Ibid.*
27. Saurin, *Sermons sur divers textes de l'Écriture Sainte* (La Haye, 1720), IV, 69.
28. *Ibid.*, 82; "Qui sert-il d'être bon politique, si l'on est mauvais chrétien?" *Ibid.*, 64.
29. I. e., John Winthrop in Mosse, "Puritanism and Reason of State in Old and New England," *William and Mary Quarterly* (January, 1953), 75.
30. Saurin, *Dissertation*, 339; blaspheming against God is, of course, included in this definition, *ibid.*, 337-338.
31. *Ibid.*, 337/338.
32. *Ibid.*, 346.
33. "Jacques Saurin to Mademoiselle de Saint-Veran," (n.d.), reprinted in J. P. Gaberel, *Jacques Saurin* (n.p., n.d.), 258. Saurin's preaching seems to have been of a different order. M. de Sayous says that in mouth virtues are dogmas, and that he did not preach by insinuation but through commands. *Histoire de la littérature Française a l'étranger* (Paris, 1853), II, 113.
34. Francis Bruys, *Mémoires*, I, 238. However, the Synod of Campen (1730) contended that only the Church of

- Arnhem had seen the MS before it was printed, thus violating the rule that the two churches must pass upon every book of this nature. "Articles Résolus au Synod des Eglises Wallons des Provinces Unie," 4. Mai, 1730, Art. XXXIV *Articles Résolus au Synode des Eglises Wallonnes des Provinces Unie des Pais Bas*, III (n.p., n.d., 1724-1733). There is a copy of this printing of the synodal proceedings in the Library of the Union Theological Seminary in New York City. While it is the chief source for the controversy, Bruys, *Mémoires*, I, has a detailed account which agrees with the picture which emerges from the official source. He also reprints some of the documents. Previous short accounts, like van Oosterzee's, relied almost entirely on the narrative of proceedings in Jacques George Chauffépié, *Nouveau Dictionaire*, etc. (Amsterdam, etc., 1756), IV, which contains full if biased accounts of the general contentions of both sides.
55. Chauffépié, *ibid.* (Amsterdam, etc., 1756), IV, 179, note C.
 56. "Articles Résolus au Synod des Eglises Wallonnes des Provinces Unie..." 4. Mai, 1730, Art. XXXIV, *Articles Résolus au Synode des Eglises Wallonnes des Provinces des Pais-Bas*, III (n.p., 1724-1733). (Hereafter, *Articles Résolus*).
 57. Chauffépié, *Nouveau Dictionaire*, etc., (Amsterdam, etc., 1756), IV, 181, note D.
 58. Bruys, *Mémoires*, I, 238. The secretary, Frescarode, wrote an ironic apology for Saurin after the proceedings were over. Van Oostersee, *Jacques Saurin* (Rotterdam, 1855), 138, n. 28.
 59. Bruys, *Mémoires*, I, 247.
 60. "Articles résolus au Synod des Eglises Wallonnes des Provinces Unie des Pais-Bas, assemble a la Haye, le jeudi matin 31. d'Aout, 1730." (hereafter, "Articles résolus... à la Haye"), Art. XLII, *Articles Résolus*, 13.
 61. *Ibid.*
 62. Bruys, *Mémoires*, I, 251.
 63. "Articles résolus... à la Haye," Art. XLII, *Articles Résolus*, 15.
 64. *Ibid.*, Art. XXXIV, 11
 65. *Ibid.*, Art. XLII, 14.
 66. *Ibid.*, Art. XLII, 16.
 67. Bruys, *Mémoires*, I, 257.
 68. "Articles résolus... à la Haye," Art. XLVI, *Articles Résolus*, 17. Apart from the omission of the reference to the Catechism, this is the same document as that which Francis Bruys reprints, *Mémoires*, I, 257.
 69. "Articles résolus... à la Haye," Art. XLVI, *Articles Résolus*, 17. Bruys, *Mémoires*, I, 258.
 70. I. e., van Oosterzee, *Jacques Saurin* (Rotterdam, 1855), 29.
 71. "Articles résolus... à la Haye," Art. XLII, *Articles Résolus*, 16.
 72. Bruys, *Mémoires*, I, 232. Beaumarchais, known usually as La Barre de Beaumarchais, was a prolific writer, a canon of the house of St. Victor, at one time in his life, and after his conversion, a continual traveler through Europe. He once thought of translating Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan* into French.
 73. Bruys, *Mémoires*, I, 230.
 74. Chauffépié *Nouveau Dictionaire*, etc. (Amsterdam, 1756), IV, 181, note D.
 75. *Ibid.* See also Bruys' own account, *Mémoires*, I, 271. Bruys claimed that Saurin betrayed him, having first promised to stand by him, *ibid.*, 272. Saurin denied this on his deathbed. M. Eng and E. M. Haag, *La France Protestante* (Paris, 1859), 180/181.
 76. For Bruys' life, see Eng and Haag, *ibid.*
 77. "Eglise Walonne... assemblé à Heusden," Jeudi, 13, Sept., 1731, Art. XXIX, *Articles Résolus*, 6/7.
 78. L. Bresson, "L'Eglise Walonne de Rotterdam," *Bulletin de la Commission de l'Histoire des Eglises Wallones*, 2e. Serie, IV (La Haye, 1909), 384.
 79. *Ibid.*
 80. Bruys, *Mémoires*, I, 263.
 81. *Ibid.*, 264-265.
 82. *Ibid.*, 263.
 83. *Ibid.*, 270.
 84. Eng and Haag, *La France Protestante* (Paris, 1859), 464. These teachers included Jean-Alphonse Turretin (1671-1737), who was influenced by Descartes and who was a friend of Pierre Bayle.
 85. *Ibid.*, 465.
 86. Annie Barnes, *Jean Le Clerc* (Paris, 1938), II.
 87. *Ibid.*, 140. For Saurin on miracles, see *L'Etat du Christianisme en France*, etc. (La Haye, 1725), 359/360.
 88. Francesco Ruffini, *Studi sui Riformatori Italiani* (Torino, 1955), 448, 529.
 89. "Sermon sur les Profondeurs Divines," *Sermons sur divers textes de l'Ecriture Sainte* (La Haye, 1720), I, 216. This is, in part, preached against the Socinians and the Arminians.
 90. Barnes, *Jean Le Clerc* (Paris, 1938), 244.
 91. Le Clerc, *Bibliothèque Ancienne et Moderne*, etc., XII (1719). (Amsterdam, 1719), 241.
 92. *Ibid.*, 249.
 93. Saurin, *Dissertation*, 346.
 94. Chauffépié, *Nouveau Dictionaire*, etc. (Amsterdam, 1756), IV, 179, note C.
 95. Saurin, *L'Etat du Christianisme en France*, etc. (La Haye, 1725), 351.
 96. *Ibid.*, 349, 334.
 97. Saurin, *Sermons sur les divers Textes de l'Ecriture Sainte* (La Haye, 1720), IV, 63.
 98. *Ibid.*, 289.

79. Saurin, *L'État du Christianisme en France etc.* (La Haye, 1725), 404. Saurin is here inveighing against submitting of one's reason to the Pope. This work was written against Catholics, temporizing Protestants, and Deists.
80. I.e., see the condemnation of casuistry in the article on that subject in the *Encyclopédie etc.* (Paris, 1751), II, 757. Saurin, of course, had harsh words

about both Bayle and the Deists, the latter of whom were making inroads among the Cartesians, Politiques, Ecclesiastics, and swordsmen. *L'État du Christianisme en France, etc.* (La Haye, 1725), 41/42.

81. Daniel Dyke, *The Mystery of Self-Deceiving, etc.* (London, 1633), 202.
82. *Ibid.*, 213.
83. *Ibid.*, 157.

DOCTRINE AND FELLOWSHIP:
WILLIAM CHANNING GANNETT AND THE
UNITARIAN CREEDAL ISSUE

WILLIAM H. PEASE, *Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute*

I

In the thirty years following the American Civil War, American society witnessed marked changes. Among the many stimuli to these changes, Darwinian evolution and the literary and intellectual Renaissance of the Middle Period were perhaps predominant. And of all the changes wrought in this thirty years of many changes, those in American religious thought may be counted among the most significant. The combined influence of a now characteristically American rationalism and of the new and as yet undigested theories of Darwinism necessitated a basic rethinking of the traditional doctrines of American Protestant theology. Not only had that earlier rationalism fostered Unitarianism; but the continued impress of New England's intellectual ferment and the impact of the new evolutionary theory created, within Unitarianism itself, a marked cleavage between liberal and conservative. Out of this division the Creedal Issue emerged.

In the East and in the West, Unitarians posed the same question: Was creedal conformity a valid test for church membership? Yes, asserted the conservatives, who clung to the early Christo-centric theology of William Ellery Channing. No, answered the liberals, who adopted the more humanistic theology of Theodore Parker. Because of this issue the Abbots, Potters, and Frothinghams bolted the National Unitarian Conference; while the Western Unitarian Conference became the spokesman of Unitarian liberalism. From 1865 until 1894 the Creedal Issue was the focus of Unitarian politics.

The American Unitarian Association, organized in 1825, had remained Boston-dominated, conservative in outlook, limited in effectiveness. A truly national organization, designed to revitalize Unitarianism and to cooperate with other liberal churches, was needed. To fulfill these aims Unitarian leaders laid careful plans; and on April 4, 1865, James Freeman Clarke delivered the sermon of welcome to the first National Conference.¹

In his address Clarke defended individual freedom in matters of belief and stressed the need for unity in church organization. Doctrine he implied was ancillary to faith; attitude, antecedent to dogma.² Certainly his remarks were not provocative. Yet here, in the organizational convention, the Creedal Issue was provoked. The focus of controversy was the Conference constitution. The liberal delegates

rejected the term "Lord Jesus Christ" in the preamble; for not only did it imply Trinitarianism, but it also implied a Christian denominationalism incompatible with open fellowship. For some liberals, in fact, the very term "Unitarian" implied creedalism.³ The liberals already knew, as John Learned summarized it twenty-eight years later, that the preamble was intended "to make the Christian confession the test and condition of Unitarian fellowship."⁴ Thus defined the Creedal Issue had come to stay.

The next year, at Syracuse, Francis Ellingwood Abbot, emphasizing Clarke's earlier suggestion, proposed changing the Conference name to the National Conference of Unitarian and Independent Churches. What he sought was an "efficient organization for practical Christian work, based rather on unity of spirit than on uniformity of belief": a non-creedal "spiritual democracy."⁵ The convention, however, voted no; and Abbot turned elsewhere.

Proposing a new religious organization whose aim would be the "freest, fullest, and highest development of the individual"; and the fullest realization of the individual human soul within itself and in the world at large; and which would welcome, without restriction, all who were in "sympathy with our purpose," and who indicated a "willingness to cooperate with it;"⁶ Abbot founded the Free Religious Association in May 1867. Among its members were many liberal Unitarians who were dissatisfied with National Conference conservatism. Abbot's defection, however, did not solve the problem, for many of his followers remained within the Unitarian church, and many liberal Unitarians never even joined the F.R.A. The Unitarian Creedal Issue, in short, was just beginning.

In the National Conference meetings of 1868, the delegates adopted, by an overwhelming vote, Edward E. Hale's resolution reasserting that all Conference declarations were but the expressions of the majority, binding none.⁷ At best, thought the liberals, that merely reaffirmed the status quo; an opinion reinforced two years later by the passage of the Hepworth resolution, which restated Unitarian allegiance to the Gospel of Christ, and limited fellowship to professed followers of Christ.⁸ The preponderant support which Hepworth's amendment received convinced the liberals that the National Conference, despite the Clarke and Hale resolutions, was still dedicated to the creedal position.

Just how conservative eastern Unitarians were was dramatically illustrated in 1874. William J. Potter, liberal clergyman of New Bedford, Massachusetts, had rejected creedalism, declaring that "Unitarian I am with reference to the Trinity, but Christian I no longer call myself, and have said so in public."⁹ The conservative editors of the Unitarian Year Book could countenance no such heresy and there-

fore dropped Potter's name from their list of Unitarian ministers. The liberals, of course, were infuriated; and the Potter Year Book Controversy became a symbol of conservative reaction and a *cause celebre* for all liberals.

* * *

During the early years of the creedal controversy, William Channing Gannett played virtually no role. Not until it erupted in the Western Unitarian Conference and acquired its more usual name, the Western Issue, did he become chief spokesman for the liberals' cause.

Gannett had been born in 1840 into the heart of Boston Unitarianism, the son of Ezra Stiles Gannett and the god-son of William Ellery Channing. Despite the heritage and early training in conservative Channing Unitarianism which he thus had, he broke from the faith of his father; for he had been more successfully nurtured in the intellectual atmosphere of Boston, and had come to know the Transcendentalism of Ralph Waldo Emerson and the Unitarianism of Theodore Parker; and he had, in his student days at Harvard, been exposed to the methods of the Higher Criticism and to the exciting new theories of Darwin and Spencer. From this background, and from his further practical experience with the Port Royal Negroes during the Civil War, Gannett had emerged with a keen sense of social responsibility, a deep faith in the efficacy of reason, and a firm conviction in the possibility of social progress.

Thus liberal in his outlook, Gannett early joined the Free Religious Association and followed closely the gradual unfolding of the Creedal Issue. Upon his graduation, in 1868, from Harvard Divinity School, he and James Freeman Clarke were selected to represent it at the National Conference convention in New York. Although he took no part in the debates, Gannett did vote in favor of the Hale amendment. The vote, however, had been one less of conviction than of duty. The resolution, he soon realized, represented an "*unintentional dishonesty*," for it barred the front door of Unitarian fellowship but left the back door carefully open.¹⁰ "A belief, a little creed so far as it goes," he explained a year later, "stands where all the public may see it,—the *principle*, the grand fellowship with all who try to love God & serve man, is in the rear . . ."¹¹ As Abbot had insisted a year earlier, it was a matter of attitude before doctrine; and Gannett had emphasized his agreement by joining the F.R.A.

It was the Hepworth resolution, however, which nearly drove Gannett out of the church. He had thought the Hale amendment and the Constitution preamble could be reversed. But, with Hepworth's victory, he wrote to his friend and colleague, John Chadwick, in Brooklyn,

I believe I shall never feel easy till I feel I've hidden *Good bye* to the Unitarⁿ body. Seen one week off that Confer. looks to me like re-affirmⁿ, for basis, of something that I don't believe in,—reaffirmⁿ more distinct than before. But before it was distinct enough. Free-Religionists are *allowed* to come into the fellowship, for *work*. Well, let us accept the toleration,—work with them of course in all good service as with Baptists or Catholics on similar invitation; but *not as members of the body*. Perhaps this has been your feeling, but it hasn't been mine; I wanted to feel that the Unitⁿ body really contained or might contain Radicals as one of its essential *wings*. But when that union can be bro't about only by a constitution whose 2 halves contradict each other, or by one whose gist is a phrase confessedly & professedly having 2 meanings & therefore adopted, it does seem as if the time were past,—as if Nature meant to indicate a parting—and that a distinct new name & organization was in place.¹²

Gannett, however, did not leave the Church. For two years after his graduation from divinity school he was minister of the Unitarian parish in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Then, for a year, he served the parish in East Lexington, Massachusetts. Thereafter, until 1877, he lived in Boston, writing a biography of his father and devoting himself to the F.R.A. and to his own studies. Finally, in 1877, he accepted the Unitarian pastorate in St. Paul, Minnesota. Thereafter, Gannett was active in the Western Unitarian Conference; and until the settlement of the Western Issue in September 1894 he was the major spokesman for liberal Unitarians.

As in the East, the Western Conference was already involved in the creedal controversy. The Conference itself had been founded in 1852, thirteen years before the National Conference. Although its constitution had enjoined only a Christian spirit and benevolence, and the Gospel of truth; the Conference—despite its generally liberal constituency—quickly became involved in the creedal dispute. At its convention in 1853, the Conference adopted as its minimum creed a belief in the divinity of Christ and in the validity of miracles. This conservative victory was, however, only temporary; for in 1860 at Quincy, Illinois, the convention resolved that the Western Conference would "welcome as fellow laborers all who are seeking to learn and to do the will of the Father and work righteousness. . ."¹³ Within seven years the liberals had asserted themselves and regained the initiative.

Finally, in 1875, two major resolutions were adopted which effectively and unequivocally established the liberals' domination of the Western Conference. The new fellowship resolution became a classic statement of the new liberal position.

...the Western Unitarian Conference conditions its fellowship on no dogmatic tests, but welcomes all thereto who desire to work with it in advancing the kingdom of God.¹⁴

The second resolution demonstrated for all what open fellowship meant in practice.

WHEREAS, "Fidelity in duty, not accuracy in belief," has been from the first among us the essential test of Christian character; and

WHEREAS, We seem in danger of losing sight of this fundamental principle through the influence of ecclesiastical agencies;

Resolved, That we deprecate and deplore the action of the American Unitarian Association in its effort to limit the fellowship of the Unitarian body, by practically defining the word "Christian" so as to make it a dogmatic shibboleth instead of a symbol of righteousness.

And, the resolution continued, getting down to specific cases, the Western Conference believes that

the removal of the name of William J. Potter from the *Year Book* of the Association was in our judgment a departure from Congregational and Unitarian principles which can only be rectified by its restoration.¹⁵

Thus, by 1875, the Creedal Issue had become clear both East and West. It was to help solve that conflict and to lead the liberals to eventual victory that William Gannett devoted much of the next twenty years.

* * *

When Gannett returned to the West he immediately launched into Western Conference politics and became, overnight, the most articulate leader of the western liberals. Within a year he and four other liberal leaders had established a new periodical, *Unity* (originally called the *Pamphlet Mission*). Though not an official organ of the Western Unitarian Conference, *Unity* rapidly became the particular spokesman for its liberal wing. So liberal was the paper, in fact, that within the year Brooke Herford, conservative Chicago pastor, took it to task. To welcome to the new paper such men as Kaufman Kohler, David Swing, and Hiram Thomas, he observed, endangered the faith.

This kind of union [he added] always works in making us fair to everybody except ourselves & our own brethren.... The more I see of this West, the more convinced I am that it is *Christianity* (i.e. Theism in relation with the memory & word of X^t), squarely & unmistakably, that is needed, & that is the only thing that will ever build up any *organized or permanent* religious life. And I am working for *that*.¹⁶

Herford had anticipated the Issue exactly. But his strictures were cries in the wilderness, for the Creedal Issue had not yet caught the imagination of the Western Conference, had not yet aroused a crusading zeal either among liberals or conservatives. The Milwaukee convention of 1880 was a case in point. It unanimously resolved—in response to an inquiry by George Chainey of Evansville, Indiana—that a bond of fellowship was the concern of the individual church; that the Western Conference, in short, did not prescribe doctrine.¹⁷ Thus the convention accurately registered its difference to doctrinal restrictions on fellowship.

When the Cleveland convention assembled in the spring of 1882, however, the black cloud of the Creedal Issue spread itself across the

horizon. Officially incorporated under Illinois law, the Western Unitarian Conference adopted an official constitution, a seal, and a motto. The motto well expressed the liberal point of view: Freedom, Fellowship and Character in Religion. It was not a part of the constitution itself, but rather of the Conference seal. Inconsequential as that fact may have seemed, it brought the Issue boiling to the surface.

Gannett immediately protested that the motto, as the expression of Western Conference liberalism, belonged at the head of the constitution. In refusing to place it there, he concluded, the convention had betrayed its ideal. That act was a "Great Refusal," a "Lost Opportunity."¹⁸

Though he had spoken thus strongly Gannett had hesitated to push the Issue. During the convention itself, Charles Wendte, himself a leading liberal, suggested that the Western Unitarian Conference "interprets Unitarian Christianity in no narrower sense than the cause of intelligence, freedom, reverence, fellowship, character and helpfulness in religion." Gannett had voted for that resolution. Its adoption, however, was less than unanimous and at his suggestion it was reconsidered and laid on the table.⁹

Gannett's reversal was clear enough. Better let the matter stand, he thought, than risk defeat by a concerted opposition.²⁰ The reticence which he had observed in this instance, however, was a reticence which liberals and conservatives alike would be unwilling to exercise for long.

If the Cleveland convention was not a complete liberal victory, still it was not a defeat. The motto had been adopted; the Conference had strengthened its official organization; and Jenkin Lloyd Jones had been made Conference Secretary. This latter was a major victory, for Jones already had a reputation as an outspoken liberal and, with Gannett, would continue a major leader of liberal Unitarians throughout the Western Conference.

Just after the convention, Jabez T. Sunderland of Ann Arbor, Michigan, emerged as principal spokesman for the conservatives. Bespeaking a positive Christian theism, he demanded more than a mere methodological ethical basis for fellowship. Freedom, Fellowship and Character in Religion were, he concluded, "lower, narrower and poorer than it [Unitarianism] was willing to accept."²¹

Two years later Sunderland returned to the attack. If he did not enlarge his philosophic position, he did pose the question of church function and purpose; and thus presaged the line of attack which, two years hence, would provoke a crisis. Most importantly, Sunderland had unmistakably asserted himself and announced that he had entered the lists of combat in earnest.²²

When the 1884 article appeared, Sunderland had replaced Jones as Conference Secretary. His new position, however, did not par-

ticularly perturb the liberals, for they—and the conservatives as well—were still sanguine that the creedal differences could and would be settled amicably.²³ The optimism of 1884, however, was virtually shattered at the St. Louis convention the following year. When he delivered his annual Secretary's report, Sunderland drew the lines taut. It was quite clear, he asserted, that the Western Unitarian Conference had neither a definite theological policy nor any cohesiveness; that it therefore welcomed non-believers who would corrupt and subvert it. Agnostics and materialists, he implied, were organized and well-knit; to combat them Unitarians must be equally well organized; and to be well organized they must require a minimum Christian theism—"Love to God and love to man."²⁴

Despite his distressing report, Sunderland was re-elected for another term. Although it was a distinctly conservative victory, the re-election commanded considerable liberal support. Rejection of his theology had not implied dislike of the man.²⁵ Clinging desperately to the rapidly fading hope of reconciliation, liberals voted for the man, not for the theologian; and they also gave him a position on the editorial board of *Unity*.

That these were futile gestures, the liberals must have known. "We had a strange Conference," Gannett wrote Chadwick back in Brooklyn:

on the whole it lifted us by the swell of a wave which might easily have drowned us. Question turned on re-election of Sunderland as Sec'y, who in his report the day before had stated a sort of reactionary platform & meant it frankly as his platform of future action, if re-elected. He is a *mere* Unitarian, i.e. has a broad circle, but wants a definite fence around that circle to shut out agnostics &c: feels it his mission to arrest our Western tendencies. Has a noble conscientiousness about it all. He was elected, 32 to 19; some of his 32 endorsing him & his platform, some endorsing him in spite of his platform. My wonder now is, how blindly he'll consider it all endorsement of his platform, & act accordingly. I was among those who voted for him in spite of it. We've also given him an inside seat at the Unity board. So the probability is more or less friction &c all the year. But if we can do all round as well as we did at the Conference, it will do us all good, perhaps. The salvation lay in the union of utter frankness with utter friendliness, & the meeting was really a noble one.²⁶

Gannett's fears however, were better founded than his hopes; for within a month Sunderland was eased from his "inside seat."

When it became evident that he would feel obliged to use his associate editorship on *Unity* to contradict the whole *go* of the paper, answering paragraphs & articles, & printing his creed recommended by him as Western Sec'y (!) time after time, we showed him that the little paper was too small to be a constant battleground, and too small to wobble, wabble, even if we refused from our side to fight—as we nearly always have refused. He saw it as well as we, I think, and kindly withdrew at once,—as he ought.²⁷

It was increasingly clear that Sunderland and the Conservatives were laying the axe at "the root of the Western tree."²⁸

The growing split between western conservatives and liberals was not without eastern ramifications. Western Unitarianism was determined to remain independent of eastern influences. Its relation to the American Unitarian Association had already been aired in the late 1860's. It would be aired again in the 1880's—this time entwined with the Creedal Issue.

In 1884 Hosmer had approved of Sunderland's election to the Secretaryship—if, he added, Sunderland received no part of his salary as western agent for the A.U.A.²⁹ In St. Louis John C. Learned agreed. It would "be a capital mistake," he had written to Hosmer, "to make the Western Conference a dependency of the A.U.A. It has a life of its own and to subject that to Boston will be to cripple and destroy it."³⁰ "I agree with you about the A.U.A. connection with W.C.," Gannett himself wrote Hosmer;

—though perhaps more because the A.U.A. is not yet on the broad ground of Faith, than because I sh'd fear our dependence on her if she were there. If we really represented one scope of Faith & enthusiasm, I sh'd think it might perhaps be well to have but one central organization. At present, no a hundred times over. We do ourselves & do them more good apart; & they do us more good: for the other way there w'd be more compromise or else more chafing,—I sh'd fear.³¹

Although Sunderland had originally agreed not to accept any A.U.A. salary, within a year he had changed his mind. He made it clear at St. Louis that he desired closer cooperation between the Western Conference and the A.U.A. in order to give the Unitarian movement added strength, to make the West less provincial in its sympathies and outlook, to temper Western radicalism, and to improve Conference Administration.³² In the end he won his point. The convention passed a series of resolutions "looking to a closer working fellowship with the A.U.A."³³ and it favored sharing expenses with the A.U.A. for a Secretary-Agent. Accordingly, a two-man committee was appointed to contact the A.U.A. Secretary and "confer with the Directors of the A.U.A. concerning future cooperation in the work in the West."³⁴

As in the past, the liberals once again supported the conservatives. But here, for once, they tempered their principles with expediency. Needing money in the Western Conference, they agreed that the A.U.A. should pay \$1000 a year toward the salary of the Western Conference Secretary, and that he should serve as its western agent.³⁵ It was a case of trying to eat the cake and have it too. But for the moment the liberals were satisfied. They convinced themselves that Sunderland was really the Western Conference Secretary, acting only

parenthetically as A.U.A. agent. They had, they thought, assured western independence.

* * *

Had the Western Issue been merely one of East-West cooperation, political compromise might have assured a peaceful future. Furthermore, the Creedal Issue had become dormant in the East. In 1884 Potter's name had been returned to the Year Book; and in 1882 the National Conference had resolved to exclude no one from fellowship by reason of a specific test of faith.³⁶

The basic issue, however, remained. The several attempts at compromise and conciliation had never, for the West, obscured the heart of the problem. Liberals still differed with conservatives on the question of Christian theism; and both sides adamantly denied any creedal tendencies. If the liberals called Christian theism a restrictive creed, the conservatives contended that the elimination of *any* basis, was equally restrictive—that excessive breadth of fellowship was no better than narrow creedalism. An impasse had been reached; there was no least common denominator in sight. Gannett saw clearly what lay ahead. "Shall persons like us here, you there," he wrote Chadwick in Brooklyn,

be recognized fully as "Unitarians", or shall the name be denied to persons saying what we do of "Christianity", & "God".... The discussion wh. in Parker's day was at the miracle-line,—in 1865-70 at the "Lordship" line—in 1880 at the "Christian" line,—[is] now at that last still, but verging towards the "God"-word line.... The deeper question will be over this thought of "God",—& all involved, at that point our little fellowship-question touching the great age-question.³⁷

Though neither fighter nor disputant by nature, Gannett stood firm, marshalling his arguments and preparing for the battle which he hoped might never come. In one of his last St. Paul sermons he explained that the difference between liberal and conservative was the difference between principle and belief.³⁸ "The name [Unitarian]," he elaborated later,

belongs *with equal right* to a wide range of intellectual positions.... with equal right to *this whole range*. A Unitarianism which claims the whole name for either third of this range, and would deprecate its use by the other two-thirds, is not the *essential Unitarianism*, I take it, no, nor the formal Unitarianism of those who a few years hence will be in our places. In other words, the *principles*, intellectual, spiritual and moral, underlying the Unitarian movement are much more its soul, its very self, than any doctrines in which at any given moment these principles are formulated, than *any* doctrines or any names whatever, even "Christ," even "God".... [Unitarianism is] a religion, then, so broad that it openly, professedly, rejoicingly gives its name to all who make an *ism* of those principles....³⁹

These were the principles whose center was " 'Ethics, and the Great Faith to which Ethics leads,—Faith in the Moral Order of the Universe, Faith in All-ruling Righteousness.' " Let that faith and ethics prevail, Gannett predicted,

then all other ideas and names,—God, Immortality, Jesus, Bible, and the rest,—would find their own due places and proportions of importance. Then for the first time we might be able to make outsiders understand "what Unitarianism is." . . . The world would listen in amaze, and we should be "Atheists" for fifty years, and then in that sign would begin to conquer.⁴⁰

The conflict between principle and belief, attitude and doctrine, was the heart of the Western Issue: for the liberal, reason, not doctrine; character, not creed; for the conservative, reason and doctrine, character and creed.⁴¹ Dogma imposed upon principle, contended Gannett, could only destroy the virtues of both. A meaningful Unitarianism was only possible "*not by trampling over our principles, but by following in their lead!*"⁴²

Gannett further observed that the conservatives overemphasized the mere mechanics of church organization, for which a creed was apparently a necessary adjunct. The conservatives themselves put it somewhat less bluntly and somewhat more accurately. "Our Churches everywhere," they replied,

are longing for more earnest, positive, *Christian* preaching. If a man means that thing, even though like some devout and tender souls we know, he shrinks from calling it by that name, we are thankful to have him with us. It is for such men that we kept our doors open. But for those who do *not* mean that,—well, we are not going on their account to shut the door, but we shall point with all the emphasis we can that it is the door of a *church*—not of a discussion hall, not of a lyceum, not even of an ethical culture society with a possibility of some time developing into religion, but of a *Christian Church*.⁴³

With equal emphasis the liberals rejoined that most of them were both theists and Christians, but that Unitarianism required them to be neither. "By fellowship," wrote Gannett, rehearsing a now well-defined position,

we mean *full* right to our common name. We do not mean church-hospitalities; we do not mean right to teach a Sunday-school class; we do not mean right to be a Unitarian laymen; we do not mean right to be ordained as Unitarian minister without previously defining one's beliefs; we mean none of these things merely, though all of them, of course, where no personal objections enter. We mean fellowship, unquestioned and co-equal right to the Unitarian name, the same for non-Christian as for Christian, for non-theist as for theist.⁴⁴

The very strength of liberal Unitarianism was, in short, its openness and its inclusiveness.

* * *

By May, 1886, conflict was inescapable. For six years Jasper Douthit of Shelbyville, Illinois, had kept up a constant rural barrage

against the liberals; in January, 1886, Sunderland had established the *Unitarian* to counteract *Unity*; and constantly the conservatives sought closer cooperation between the Western Conference and the American Unitarian Association. Then, as the convention assembled at Cincinnati, the Western Issue boiled over. Sunderland had just published a pamphlet, the *Issue in the West*, elaborately summarizing the conservative position, and, in effect, declaring open war upon the Conference liberals.

Sunderland's strategy was appealingly simple. He merely dismissed the principal arguments of his opponents. The Issue was neither over men or ethics; it was neither between radicals nor conservatives, freedom nor bondage, dogma nor non-dogma. It was not, as Gannett had contended, between "principles" and "doctrines." The Issue, Sunderland observed, "comes on the side of the pulpit. Shall our pulpits and pastorates be open to known disbelievers in the simple fundamentals of Christian theism?"

If the Issue was so uncomplicated, so unimportant, why had Sunderland launched his attack directly at the assembling convention? Under the circumstances, it amounted to a declaration of war. He answered the question in detail. In the first place, Christian theism was a matter of truth, not opinion. In the second place, apparent differences ought to be aired to assure Conference harmony and to permit effective missionary work. In the third place, a coherent organization required a minimum creed. Furthermore, to reject theism was to confuse revolution and evolution. Finally, conversion was not accomplished by lowering the converter, but by raising the unconverted.⁴⁵

No matter on which side of the argument one stood, Sunderland's analysis belied his own implication that the Western Issue was simple. It illustrated, in fact, what the liberals had constantly contended, that the Western Issue was one of creed and open fellowship; that the basic doctrines of Christianity were being questioned by those who declared that fixity of form bespoke static and primitive dogma, but that change, growth, and evolution bore witness to universal principles.

As the convention opened, Secretary Sunderland observed unequivocally

that our societies are really *churches*, that our Unitarian movement means freedom of inquiry perfect, and rejection of all creeds absolute, and a religion of character unconditioned, but that it *also* deeply means *God*, according to man's highest possible thought of God, and *worship* according to man's noblest thought of worship, and *faith* in the *immortal destiny* of *man's spirit*, and allegiance to the great spiritual ideals of life and love and duty which shine in such surpassing brightness in *Jesus*.⁴⁶

The battle of Cincinnati had begun. For two days motions and resolutions came thick and fast. Oscar Clute wished to put the Conference on a basis of "pure Christianity." James T. Bixby of Ann Arbor

tried to straddle the Issue and preserve for both sides the best of all possible worlds. Dr. Robbins of Quincy, Illinois, side-stepped the whole Issue by taking shelter in Unitarianism's congregational polity. Sunderland declared that Unitarianism's purpose was the "promotion of a religion of love to God and love to man."⁴⁷

One after another the resolutions had been tabled or defeated; and at the end of the second day the convention returned to three resolutions which Gannett had offered earlier.

Resolved, That the Western Unitarian Conference conditions its fellowship on no dogmatic tests, but welcomes all who wish to join it to help establish truth, and righteousness, and love in the world.

Resolved, That while the above expressly represents the basis and the width of our fellowship, and while the Conference has neither the wish nor the right to bind itself or any single member by a declaration of doctrines, it yet thinks some practical good may be done by setting forth in simple words the things most commonly believed to-day among us; the statement to be always open to restatement, and to be regarded only as the thought of the majority.

Resolved, That to this end a Committee of five be appointed to draw up such a declaration of beliefs, to be submitted to the Conference at its next annual meeting.⁴⁸

The second and third resolutions were so openly a compromise that neither conservatives nor liberals would accept them. The first resolution, however, was adopted.⁴⁹

The liberals had won a battle, not yet the war. As the convention ended, "all gathered for a moment side by side, and, with a quiet word of prayer and the name of God in our hearts, we went out."⁵⁰ The convention perhaps had adjourned in tranquillity, but in Western Conference ranks the division was complete.

II

The Cincinnati convention marked the beginning of eight years of open conflict. That war had broken out was in part the result of long-felt personal antagonisms. Throughout the Western Conference the *Unity* men had irritated both moderates and conservatives; in Michigan Sunderland had antagonized the state conference; from Shelbyville had come the caustic voice of that "waspish" fellow, Jasper Douthit; in St. Louis John Snyder and John Learned had captained rival factions; and on the convention floor itself the liberals, some said, had ridden rough-shod over the opposition.⁵¹ Charles Wendte, himself a liberal, condemned the whole Conference. "The W.C., and Unitarianism in general—as you show," he wrote to Samuel Barrow,

—has always been of the ethical basis of fellowship. To say so does not make us more truly ethical, if it *costs* so much. Never was the spirit of the W. C. so *unethical* as now. The personal feeling, antagonisms, &

divisions created by the extreme measures advocated by earnest but extreme men are saddening, & might all have been averted if *spiritual affinities* & not platforms or declarations or creeds (ethical or theological), had been trusted in the future as in the past.⁵²

And Charles Ames observed that the conflict had come largely because "a few excellent people feel it their duty to be very persistent in pressing a needless issue."⁵³

Gannett himself was at the center. He was excoriated by the conservatives for fighting against Christian theism, and scolded by his friends for his unnecessary enthusiasm. "You little know . . .," Isabel Barrows wrote him from Boston,

how much blame *you* are getting as being the progenitor of all this imbrogllo. As I heard one of your strong admirers say the other day: "Dear Will Gannett, I know he was honest in it, but what a pity that he should have felt it necessary to start up this quarrel." Another said: "Mr. Gannett makes this mistake: he lives in heaven while he is on earth & he thinks every body else can and ought to, but it can't be done."⁵⁴

Sylvan S. Hunting, on the other hand, thought him the "*incarnation of the ethical philosophy of Unitarianism*" in marked contrast to Sunderland, who "must be born again before he will grasp the point made by Gannett."⁵⁵

Praised or blamed, however, Gannett was right on one point. "I fear we are in, here, for a long hard time," he wrote to Barrows. "There's no knowing what they [the conservatives] mean to do: but the two or three leaders are of the relentless kind, and I suppose it means new organization of some sort . . ."⁵⁶ It did. The convention had scarcely adjourned when the conservative leaders resigned from the Western Conference. As Sunderland had earlier established the *Unitarian* to express their opinions, they now formed the Western Unitarian Association to undertake "a more definite cooperation with the A.U.A. in its Western work to diffuse the knowledge and promote the interests of pure Christianity."⁵⁷

With the convention over, a voluminous airing of opinions began. Conservatives charged that the conference "has distinctly repudiated Christianity and Theism as the *objects* for which it is *working*, and adopted *ethical* principles as its *objects*."⁵⁸ Jasper Douthit arraigned the liberals for having, like Jeff Davis, turned the Western Conference into a house divided.⁵⁹ With acid tongue and an almost pathetic humor he assailed the ringleader.

We understand that Mr. Gannett publicly expressed a desire at the beginning of the Conference, that it (the Conference) should not only be open at the top, but that it should also have the walls torn down and the bottom knocked out. Well, the kind soul has got his desire . . . he has succeeded, in the eyes of the mass of good and bad people, in putting

the Western Conference on an atheistic platform. While Mr. Gannett's amendment was not made by atheists, it is nevertheless atheistic.

Sincerity does not prevent scholarly and good men from doing some very foolish things, sometimes.⁶⁰

Most effectively, perhaps, a *Unitarian* editorial declared that Unitarians must unflinchingly believe in God, Christ, immortality, and worship; that they must exclude materialists and atheists from their fellowship; and that Unitarian missionary organizations should teach conservative Christian theism. The liberals, continued the editorial, took an opposite view. If the conservatives said yes, the liberals said no; or, if the liberals were not sure, they rejoined with a weak maybe. The conservatives had left no doubt where they stood: four-square for Christian theism. Gannett's resolution was flatly rejected.⁶¹

There was no gainsaying one conservative contention: the liberals certainly did assess the convention differently. Frederick Hosmer thought it was a further step in growing Unitarian liberalism;⁶² and Jones, although he saw a hard road ahead, was confident that the outcome of the convention would "result in vastly strengthening the movement which alone holds the future of Unitarianism."⁶³ Samuel J. Barrows, editor of the *Christian Register*, also hailed the convention as a milestone in liberal religion. "The action of the conference simply means," the *Register* had summarized, "that no form of doctrine, however precious to any or all its members, shall set limits to its fullest fellowship or exclude any brother who is spiritually drawn to it."⁶⁴ And back in the West, the W.U.C. directors asserted that the Gannett resolution neither caused nor foretold any change in Conference aims. It did, in fact, make possible an enriched Christian theism. Since "theists are theists still, [and] Christians are Christians still," it was not true, the liberals asserted, that the Conference had become materialistic and atheistic. Open fellowship had guaranteed the deepest possible spirituality.⁶⁵

Gannett himself agreed with Jones that the fight had just begun. Since several of the larger western churches had supported Sunderland and eastern Unitarianism, the East, he predicted, would be a decisive factor in resolving the Issue. Should the East fail to support the Western Conference,

much danger these money-bag chhes—not the chhes of deep faith (Jesus was right!) will go off or help nothing. If they won't act in a hurry, but wait till fall, I think the true "issue" by that time will be so much more seen all round that most of the danger will pass. It will take wisdom & love & holy spirit work all round!⁶⁶

Despite his fears, Gannett was pleased with his victory. The W.U.C. resolution of 1875, he observed, had retained theism as a doctrinal limitation to fellowship. The National Conference resolution

of 1882 had implied that the minority was admitted to fellowship only by a mere suffrage.⁶⁷ The crux of the matter was less doctrine than attitude. Furthermore, Gannett continued, his defeated resolutions had envisaged a *credo* without a *crede*. Had they been adopted they would have helped unify "an organization *with beliefs jointly avowed*, and yet *not organized upon those beliefs*."⁶⁸ They would have effected the best of all possible worlds.

Gannett reserved his sharpest commentary, however, for Sunderland's *Issue in the West*. Sunderland's conceptions had been, he pointed out, a series of basic misconceptions. The liberals had not deliberately intended to remove Christian theism from Unitarianism. They had, in fact, done the opposite. Demanding theism from no one, yet they welcomed it as part of open fellowship. "Freedom, Fellowship and Character in Religion" was not, Gannett continued, a statement of belief, but a statement of principle. There was a fundamental difference. Principle was methodology and attitude; belief, merely its logical extension. Belief, therefore, was ancillary to principle.

Most seriously, perhaps, Sunderland had misconceived his own position. He claimed, on the one hand, that conservatives rejected any "formulated, systematized statement of theological doctrine, made out and imposed by some supposed ecclesiastical authority,— synod, council or other." Yet, on the other hand, they did believe in a "doctrinal test of religious fellowship." What was the difference? Slice it any way and it still spelled *crede*, a required doctrinal orthodoxy.⁶⁹

Within two months then both sides had elaborately clarified their positions. What happened next would depend, in part, upon day-to-day relations between East and West.

* * *

Twice before the American Unitarian Association had played an important role in Western Conference development. What it would do now, with the Western Conference split down the middle, was a crucial question for the entire church.

Gannett, as usual, knew just what was at stake. Sunderland, he explained, was trying "to establish a monetary and official dependence of the West. Unit^m on the A.U.A." If the A.U.A. retained him as its western agent, it would in effect, give complete support to the conservatives; for, as A.U.A. agent, he could further split the Western Conference. And Sunderland, if nothing else, was persistent.

On the other hand, if the A.U.A. did not retain him, that would not be tantamount to a disavowal of the conservatives. Since Sunderland's value to the A.U.A. had initially stemmed from his Western Conference Secretaryship, it would scarcely be strange if the A.U.A. now replaced him. At most such action might suggest A.U.A. neutrality over the Issue.⁷⁰ In any event, Gannett's implication was

clear: the only acceptable action for the A.U.A. was actively to support the W.U.C. If it did not support the liberals, it supported, by default, the conservatives.

The A.U.A., however, turned a deaf ear. Having presented its formal thanks to Sunderland for his past work—a wholly acceptable mark of respect and appreciation—, it then postponed any definitive action until the next fall.⁷¹ Despite the annoyance of the western liberals, the A.U.A. staunchly defended its neutralism. As an administrative body it had both a weather eye for funds and a desire to remain aloof from theological disputes. To have been partisan would have been both unwise and extremely difficult; for three different groups constantly pulled the Association in opposing directions. The W.U.A. pulled right; the W.U.C. pulled left; and the middle-of-the-road enthusiasts like T. B. Forbush lashed out against everybody.⁷² How else but by neutralism could the A.U.A. keep everyone happy? That was the irony of it all. By trying to keep everyone happy it kept no one happy.

John Effinger, Western Conference Secretary, asserted that the A.U.A.'s hesitancy presaged its repudiation of Sunderland and the W.U.A. John Learned, however, predicted that the A.U.A. would desert to the Sunderland-Herford forces. Albert Walkeley, a conservative, thought that all Unitarian organizations ought to surrender their executive functions to the A.U.A. Forbush and the middleroaders believed in the executive autonomy of the state conferences. And Sunderland himself demanded that the A.U.A. act quickly, giving open support to the W.U.A.⁷³ But, despite the variety of opinion, it was perfectly clear that the A.U.A. sat on the fence.

* * *

With prospects for eastern support so dubious, the liberals fell back on their own resources. If the 1886 convention had been a liberal victory, that victory, at best, had been only partial. Gannett himself proposed to fight for the complete adoption of the Cincinnati program: a firm ethical basis to which general doctrinal statements could be added as general, non-binding expressions of majority opinion.⁷⁴ In 1886 that had been too broad for conservatives, for liberals too narrow.

As the 1887 convention approached, however, Gannett's plan was debated afresh. The conservatives, on the defensive, argued from expediency, pointing out that the 1886 resolution was still ethical and non-theistic, and that to add the things most commonly believed would only interfere "with the private beliefs of the individuals who make up the Conference." All the Conference could legally do, asserted the conservatives somewhat illogically, was to "make it clear what it, the Conference, stands for [,] that is, what is its *purpose* or *aim* as an *organization*."⁷⁵ Liberal opinion, on the other hand, merely echoed

Gannett; asserting that, since Unitarianism was congregational, no statements of belief could "be regarded as a statement of theological doctrine."⁷⁶ The middle-roaders were even more congregationalist, making common cause with the conservatives by insisting that "all questions of belief and fellowship belong to and must be determined by individual churches."⁷⁷

Gannett, himself, thought that to finish the work of 1886 would guarantee equal fellowship to creedalists and anti-creedalists alike. Fellowship by mere suffrage would give way to a "freer, better-working kind of Congregationalism among us," he contended; and a non-binding doctrinal statement would illuminate "the deep things of the Spirit."⁷⁸ Furthermore, John Learned added, such a statement would "relieve some of the innocent and heretofore ignorant misunderstanding—east and west."⁷⁹

For all the vigorous sparring which had preceded the meeting, the 1887 convention was remarkably placid. Although resolutions were offered by both liberals and conservatives, the convention turned them all down, adopting in the end Gannett's proposals. How great had been the victory was mirrored by the 59 to 13 vote.⁸⁰

The "Things Most Commonly Believed Today Among Us" outlined the historical assertions of Unitarianism, defined the principle of fellowship, and listed the general doctrinal beliefs of the Church. Historically, Unitarianism asserted that character preceded belief, and reason, revelation; that man's nature was good, not evil; that God was a unity, not a trinity; that Christ was a preceptor and exemplar, "not . . . a substitute to save us from the penalties of sin"; and that events were natural and verifiable by the use of intelligence. Fellowship, the statement continued, was a congregational function, independent of creed or doctrine, validated only by character and freedom.

Among the generally accepted doctrines of Unitarianism, the statement asserted that living and loving the Good was the supreme essence of religion; that reason and conscience were the final religious arbiters; that the Bible was inspiring literature, not divine fiat; that the universe was beautiful, beneficent, and orderly; that no good failed, no evil succeeded; that man should strive to make the good better and the evil good; that selflessness and loyalty to all men were the highest of ideals; and that one should worship God, the source of universal life and law.⁸¹

The acceptance of the Gannett statement had codified the broadest possible basis of Unitarian theology; and it had demonstrated, indirectly, the impact of contemporary thought upon Unitarianism. Implicit was a recognition of modern, critical scholarship; of the ideas and precepts of contemporary scientific thought; of the gospel of progress and well-being; and of the principles of social awareness, re-

sponsibility, and action imposed upon traditional American individualism. The statement, in short, had illuminated that Freedom, Fellowship and Character which were already a part of liberal Unitarianism.

* * *

The 1887 convention also discussed East-West relations, climaxing again several months of pre-convention sparring. Very likely Samuel Barrows knew of Forbush's contention that most western Unitarians blamed Sunderland for having pushed the "Issue" to its present crisis; and that the A.U.A.'s retention of Sunderland as western agent would be about as popular as "the appointment of Jeff Davis to the U. S. Cabinet would be to the Republican party."⁸² Barrows, in any event, assembled a committee of Western Conference sympathizers early in 1887

to see what could be done to consolidate and give more effectiveness to our missionary interests, especially to study the practical relation which the National Conference, the Western Conference, and the A.U.A. should hold to each other.

The committee reported that local missionary work should be done by local conferences, national work by a national organization, and that all missionary work should be considered "independently of theological questions."⁸³ Such an arrangement would insure effective cooperation between East and West without subordinating one to the other. With Western Conference delegates in A.U.A. councils, the West would retain control of those missionary funds which it had contributed. Furthermore, this East-West cooperation would avoid duplication, overlapping and friction. To placate western sceptics, Barrows pointed out that recent constitutional changes made the A.U.A. a truly national organization, a rapprochement with which would effectively silence the rival W.U.A.⁸⁴

Gannett, however, thought differently. He feared an inevitable Western Conference subordination to the A.U.A., and was convinced that theological questions could not be avoided. The A.U.A., he felt, would remain a Boston-dominated organization. The heart of Gannett's argument, however, was that the rift within western ranks and between East and West was too deep to be healed by superficial methods. Practical cooperation was, under the circumstances, an anesthetic, not a curative. The Issue, he concluded, would not be resolved until men on both sides could "escape from that spirit and that conception of Unitarianism that made it possible."⁸⁵

Later that same spring A.U.A., W.U.C., and W.U.A. representatives met in Chicago. Rapprochement seemed hopeless; for as Gannett remarked afterward,

They [the A.U.A.] really were placed in a very tight place: probably Sunderland's action [breaking from the W.U.C.] has cost them some thousands of dollars this year by lessening their income from timid givers

—wh. means lessening their ability to do mission work. And if they should fully approve the W.U.C., it w'd perhaps half split the denomination East . . .⁸⁶

From the meeting came nothing. The A.U.A. demanded cooperation as the price for peace in the Church. Nor did it seem an unreasonable demand until it was explained that the price for cooperation was the acceptance of "that 'theistic & Xⁿ' basis' &c." As its alternative, the A.U.A. announced that it would conduct its own missionary work in the West.⁸⁷ "I have never felt more sure," observed Gannett after the meeting had disbanded,

that the W.U.C. had a work to do—by life, if possible,—if not, by suffering & dying—than I did at the end of that meeting with A.U.A. men. If it is the "Year Book" issue over again to them, and it probably *is*, *ought we not to face it?* Not in wrath—(I have no "mad")—but *unflinchingly*. Are we to "get into harmony with A.U.A. by some dignified explicit statement" justifying those limits in missionary work which were at last, after long hugging, abandoned in "Year-Book" & in "Nat. Conv.",—or rather ought we by a dignified explicit stand to indicate our dissent from those terms, and so by our present pain lead them to the higher position? *Of course* it will cost us pain,—but *what else are we for*, now that the call has reached us?⁸⁸

With negotiations completely broken down, the East-West Issue was introduced on the convention floor in Cincinnati. Again the problem was thoroughly re-examined, again all the arguments were aired and ventilated. The middle-roaders, the left, and the right all reiterated their well-worn arguments; sound and fury signified little; for, if the convention acted, it did nothing more than adopt a resolution proposing a general missionary board for the Western Conference; and appoint a committee to arrange for such a board.⁸⁹ At best, cooperation was still a dream.

* * *

The results of the 1887 convention surprised no one. Two major issues had been at stake: open fellowship and East-West cooperation. Neither had been solved satisfactorily. The first had been defeat for the conservatives, the second had been a victory for none.

Everyone found such pleasure or displeasure with the results as he could. Barrows exclaimed ecstatically that the Gannett resolution

says to all lovers of truth, righteousness, and love: You are cordially welcome to come and work with us. Our doors stand open, but *we believe*; and in a grand and beautiful statement which embodies more of the spirit of Unitarianism than any similar declaration we know of, it tells *what* it believes.⁹⁰

The *Unitarian*, however, knowing just how widely the doors were open, gave special notice to David Utter's remonstrance that "if any of you should hear at any time in the future someone talking about an ethical basis for the Unitarian church, count him as a dreamer, one who is

blind to the consequences of his pretty, airy theories."⁹¹ Then, several years later, the *Unitarian* called the liberals "dishonest" for their presumed exclusion of Christian theists.⁹² And John Snyder, turning caustic, published a series of *Unity*-men definitions. Religion was "a certain indefinable sense of awe and wonder produced by the contemplation of the universal not-ourselves"; theology was "the chief enemy to religion, always insisting upon clear definitions in thought and language"; a Unitarian was "One who accepts the 'Principles' of 'Freedom, Fellowship and Character'"; and a bigot, "one who differs with the Western Conference."⁹³

Though not all mere acrimony and vindictiveness, the years ahead were a period of basic divisions and struggles.⁹⁴ Turning to an earlier suggestion, Gannett sought harmony by suggesting regional centers. He also suggested that the western Conference Directors, the A.U.A. advising, the W.U.C. actually spending.⁹⁵ "Till Unitarianism," he warned, "not by any means utterly, but much more thoroughly than now, *de-Bostonizes* itself, it can never do much to this big land."⁹⁶

At the same time another try at East-West cooperation was getting under way. In the fall of 1889 it was decided to sponsor a large meeting in Chicago in 1890 preparatory to establishing a Unitarian Conference Association or Advisory Missionary Board. Throughout the midwest the venture commanded considerable support.⁹⁷ Not, however, from the *Unity* men. John Effinger feared that it would blur the issue of open fellowship and undermine the Western Conference.⁹⁸ Gannett himself observed that the purpose of the meeting was to "flank the W.U.C. out of existence if possible." Peace was the goal, he asserted; but peace only with distinctness and independence.⁹⁹ The Western Conference, therefore, sent no delegates to the meeting.

Meanwhile, the A.U.A. was busy defending its own fence-straddling. The executive arm of Unitarianism, it reiterated, could, neither wisely nor legally, assume any doctrinal position. But it also felt that, for efficiency's sake, it ought to be the executive arm for all Unitarians. On that basis it invited Gannett, as representative of the western liberals, to join its Board of Directors.¹⁰⁰ Gannett answered the invitation in no uncertain terms.

It would not be fair to either you or me. I do not feel myself sufficiently at one with the A.U.A. to represent it by holding office under it or in it. And I expect to have to remain one of its outspoken critics, and it would not be right to be inside its councils and at the same time its outside critic.¹⁰¹

The A.U.A., he continued, had attacked the Western Conference for its refusal to "make doctrinal words essential and limitary to Unitarianism"; it had given its support to the W.U.A.; and it had adopted the W.U.A.'s ultimatum, "Say 'Christianity,' or else give up all mission-

ary endeavors to the A.U.A.' " If the A.U.A. did not have any "bad heart" or evil intent, it was, nonetheless, "constitutionally timid" and quite unneutral. On that note, Gannett observed that since they were so far apart on basic issues their correspondence better end.¹⁰²

So unpromising did events appear that, by the end of 1892, Gannett remarked that "Unitarianism is doomed to be a 'Boston notion' " except for some hard work and perhaps a miracle. But still he looked hopefully to the time when

Forbush will go to the heaven of an eastern parish, and the A.U.A. will be judged as the good & faithful servant of just *one* talent, and the kingdom at large will be taken out of her hands, and the Western Secretary (FLH) will be glorified into an agent trusted of the East & supported by the West, and the fox (G.W.) shall lie down inside the Buffalo (JLJ) of the prairies, and there shall be four Jerusalems instead of one—Boston, N.Y., Chicago, San Francisco, with one or two more in embryo,—and the knowledge of Unitarianism in its best & noblest & widest meanings shall cover the land as the waters cover the bed of the sea....¹⁰³

* * *

In the summer of 1891 Gannett had exhorted the liberals to stand firm and to wait "without the least *demand*, I hope, but not without a steady pressing protest; this much to serve the cause to wh. we all belong."¹⁰⁴

At the Western Conference convention in 1892, Sunderland suggested a resolution proposing

That to the statement of "things most commonly believed to-day among us," adopted by the Western Conference in 1887, the following supplementary resolution be adopted—the same to be printed regularly with that statement:

Resolved, That the Western Unitarian Conference hereby declares it to be its common aim and purpose to promulgate a religion in harmony with the foregoing preamble and statement.¹⁰⁵

It was adopted by a large majority.¹⁰⁶ To Gannett, however, its acceptance compromised the 1886 position. "The Conference is weary of its loneliness," he wrote, trying to explain this turn of events. "It chooses quick peace on the lower level, instead of slower but lasting peace, with wider service to the world, upon the higher level."¹⁰⁷ Restating the resolution, Gannett showed that it did no less than replace the ethical basis with the theological basis.

Resolved, That the Conference reaffirms its preamble, that is, its purely "ethical basis" of fellowship, and its declaration that any statement of doctrinal beliefs it makes, is but a statement of the day, always open to re-statement, and to be regarded only as the thought of the majority; *but*, while reaffirming this, it hereby expressly declares it to be its general aim and purpose to *limit its missionary work to the particular statement of beliefs set forth in Chicago in 1887*.¹⁰⁸

This "Dimmed Ideal" was a real set-back. "I confess, Fred," he wrote to Hosmer,

that I can't get over the *moral shock* of it . . . that *our* men & women *could* consent to dim that principle of liberty for wh. they had stood so sturdily 6 years against all pressure . . . it *hurts* way down—much as the A.U.A. timorousness and unfrankness hurts: hurts more, for from the A.U.A. one expects it, but these were—some of them—our own men & women with the *scars* on them!¹⁰⁹

The hurt was deep; and Gannett contemplated dropping his Directorship in the Western Conference, for he was weary of the struggle.¹¹⁰ It seems, he said, that "for me to talk or write of 'Issue' affairs to anybody is to say the same things over and over and over: I look at almost everything exactly as I did in 1886."¹¹¹

The Conference, however, was also dissatisfied with the compromise: and the next year it corrected it. For two days during the 1893 convention resolutions were offered from all quarters. A long one by A. W. Gould set the pace for the debate; and Arthur Judy's condensed version was passed with only one dissenting vote.

WHEREAS, It has been understood by some persons that the supplementary resolution of 1892 limits our fellowship by a doctrinal test, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we renew our welcome to all who wish to join us in our labors, limiting our fellowship and our work by no lines of doctrinal belief.¹¹²

A year's aberration was thus quickly corrected.

* * *

It had taken just two years for the Western Issue to crystalize, from the St. Louis convention of 1885 to the Chicago convention of 1887. In exactly the same length of time the Issue was settled, from the 1892 convention to the National Conference convention in 1894. That settlement told just how deep the Creedal Issue had cut. When conservatives and liberals, East and West, finally agreed upon a common Unitarian principle, the ancillary problems quickly evaporated. Harmony and cooperation were reestablished. By 1896 the Western churches had reunited and their Conference Secretary was Superintendent of the American Unitarian Association.

In 1891 the National Conference had appointed a committee on constitutional revision. Its recommendations were submitted to the Saratoga convention in September, 1894. The critical portions of the revisions were the preamble and the first and eighth articles.

The Conference of the Unitarian and Other Christian Churches was formed in the year 1865, with the purpose of strengthening the churches and societies which should unite in it for more and better work for the kingdom of God. These churches accept the religion of Jesus, holding, in accordance with his teaching, that practical religion is summed up in love to God and love to man.

Article I. The churches and other organizations here represented unite themselves in a common body to be known as the National Conference of Unitarian and Other Christian Churches . . .

Article VIII. The Conference recognizes the fact that its constituency is Congregational in tradition and polity. Therefore, it declares that nothing in this constitution is to be construed as an authoritative test; and we cordially invite to our working fellowship any who, while differing from us in belief, are in general sympathy with our spirit and our practical aim.¹¹³

The only discussion on the floor concerned the proposal to move Article VIII into the preamble, a suggestion which aroused no particular opposition. Then, as it came time to vote on the revisions, Gannett asked that the entire convention wait until the afternoon session so that all the delegates might have time to study the revisions in detail. The suggestion was adopted by a large majority; and, during the lunch hour, Gannett had the revision printed in final form for the delegates to study before casting their votes.¹¹⁴

Promptly at 3:30 President Hoar put the vote to the convention. Immediately a tumultuous "Aye" sounded through the hall. When the "No" vote was called for, there was a deathlike silence. The effect was spontaneous. Seconds passed. Then the convention rose to its feet as a man, with a deafening roar and with frantic handclapping. Handkerchiefs waved in the air, men's eyes filled with tears. At the climax, Dr. Peabody rose and led the convention in singing the doxology. "All dispute," editorialized the *Unitarian*, "disappeared in faith, all wrangling in love, all individual idiosyncracies were hushed in the one great holy spirit of God's peace."¹¹⁵

Gannett had fought for over a decade. The cause which he had done so much to foster had emerged triumphant. American Unitarianism had finally established itself firmly upon a liberal, ethical basis. Gannett knew what that victory meant, and he was glad.

You are so far out of it all [he wrote to his old friend, Mary Rice] that the echoes will hardly reach you, & you'd wonder, should you read the Preamble what in it could move the great throng so. But it really does show great advance in both thought and in spirit. The long trouble in the Nat. Conf. has really been in essence the same as our "Issue in the West", & both Conferences have settled it in—not quite—but much the same way, & that way for freedom from name & doctrinal tests of fellowship.¹¹⁶

That was a paean of joy. The quiet prayer of thanksgiving emerged in the terse summary of Mary Gannett. "At noon report of Revision Committee—Will urged time to consider & went without dinner to get resolutions printed & distributed—then at 3:30—a unanimous aye—and the 30 yrs. struggle is over—"¹¹⁷

1. For the details of the organization of the National Conference see *Report of the Convention of Unitarian Churches Held in New York, on the 5th and 6th of April, 1865, and of the Organization of the National Conference*

(this title and subsequent National Conference Reports hereafter cited as *National Conference Report*); also Charles H. Lyttle, *Freedom Moves West. A History of the Western Unitarian Conference, 1852-1952* (Boston,

- 1952), 119-120; and George Willis Cooke, *Unitarianism in America* (Boston, 1902), 190-1.
2. *National Conference Report* (1865), 1-32.
 3. Stowe Persons, *Free Religion. An American Faith* (New Haven, 1947), 15. Cooke, *Unitarianism in America*, 193.
 4. John Learned, "Post-Transcendental Unitarianism," *Unity*, XXXII (October, 1893), 88-91. It was little to the point that the convention also passed a resolution declaring "that all the resolutions and declarations of this Convention are expressions only of its majority, committing in no degree those who object to them"; and that they "are all dependent wholly for their effect upon the consent they command on their own merits, from the Churches here represented or belonging within the circle of our special fellowship." For the liberals this was at best indecisive, at worst, sophistical. The preamble, after all, was the key to official attitude. See *National Conference Report* (1865), 39.
 5. *National Conference Report* (1866), 20.
 6. Francis E. Abbot to William J. Potter, November 21, 1866; cited in Sidney E. Ahlstrom, "Francis Ellingwood Abbot" (MS Ph.D. thesis. Harvard, 1951), II, 82. In the December issue of the *Radical*, Abbot made public his plan to break with the National Unitarian Conference; see "Organization," *Radical*, II (December, 1866), 219-25.
 7. *National Conference Report* (1868), 87.
 8. *National Conference Report* (1870), 123. The vote was 267 to 33.
 9. Quoted in *American Unitarian Association. Anniversaries and Reports* (1874) (published annually; hereafter cited as *A.U.A. Reports*), 16.
 10. William C. Gannett to Ezra S. Gannett, [November 87, 1868], from the collection of Lewis S. Gannett, West Cornwall, Connecticut (hereafter cited LSG).
 11. William C. Gannett, "What is a Liberal Christian?" (MS Sermon #45, [October 31, 1869], from the William Channing Gannett Collection, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, New York (hereafter cited WCG-CR).
 12. William C. Gannett to John W. Chadwick, October 31, 1870, from the William C. Gannett Collection, University of Rochester, Rochester, New York (hereafter cited WCG).
 13. For a summary of Western Unitarian Conference developments during these early years see Lyttle, *Freedom Moves West*, 75, 78-9; and Cooke, *Unitarianism in America*, 171. The quotation is taken from the latter source.
 14. Quoted in Charles W. Wendte's ["Report of the Western Conference Meeting"], *Christian Register*, LVI (May 22, 1875), 3.
 15. *Ibid.*, 3.
 16. Brooke Herford to William C. Gannett, April 10, 1879, WCG.
 17. *Unity*, V (July 1, 1880), 150.
 18. William C. Gannett, "Creeds that Never Grow Old," *Unity*, IX (June 16, 1882), 168. See also "Proceedings of the Twenty-eighth Session of the Western Unitarian Conference," *Unity*, IX (May 16, 1882), 126-8.
 19. "Proceedings . . .," *Unity*, IX (May 16, 1882), 126-8.
 20. William C. Gannett, "The Creed that Never Grows Old," *Unity*, X (September 1, 1882), 274. Wendte, however, *Unity*, IX (August 16, 1882), 248-9, had contended that the resolution did command unanimous support.
 21. Jabez T. Sunderland, "Defining Unitarianism," *Unity*, X (September 16, 1882), 291-2.
 22. Jabez T. Sunderland, "The Relation of the Church To-day to the Religious Life," *Christian Register*, LXIII (June 19, 1884), 392.
 23. See, for example, Frederick L. Hosmer to William C. Gannett, July 5, 1884, WCG.
 24. "Annual Report of Rev. J. T. Sunderland, Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference," *Unity*, XV (May 23, 1885), 121-7.
 25. "Proceedings of the Thirty-first Annual Meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference," *Unity*, XV (May 23, 1885), 135-7.
 26. William C. Gannett to John W. Chadwick, May 12, 1885, WCG.
 27. William C. Gannett to John W. Chadwick, December 12, 1885, WCG. For conservative comment on Sunderland's withdrawal from *Unity*, see Jabez T. Sunderland, "A Card to Readers of *Unity*," *Unity*, XV (June 15, 1885), 184; and [Jasper Douthit], "Secretary Sunderland's Withdrawal from 'Unity,'" *Our Best Words*, VI (July, 1885), 9. Douthit wrote that Sunderland was "compelled to withdraw" because of the "non-christian, agnostic, and materialistic tendency" of *Unity*.
 28. William C. Gannett to Mary T. Lewis, November 10, 1885, LSG. On November 3, 1887, Mary T. Lewis became Gannett's wife.
 29. Frederick L. Hosmer to William C. Gannett, July 5, 1884, WCG.
 30. John C. Learned to Frederick L. Hosmer, May 23, 1884, WCG.
 31. William C. Gannett to Frederick L. Hosmer, May 23, 1884, WCG.

32. "Annual Report of Rev. J. T. Sunderland . . .," *Unity*, XV (May 23, 1885), 121-7.
33. Draft copy, William C. Gannett to Grindall Reynolds, June [24?], 1886, WCG.
34. *Ibid.* Indicative of the liberals' desire to avoid a split was the fact that Gannett himself was a member of the two-man committee. David Utter was the other member.
35. *Ibid.* See also *Unity*, XVI (September 5, 1885), 8.
36. For these developments see, for example, *National Conference Report* (1880), 151-2; and *ibid.* (1882), 26, for the broadened fellowship resolution was adopted with but one dissenting vote, and replaced the older Article IX of 1870. On the resolution see, also, Earl Morse Wilbur, *Unitarianism in Transylvania, England, and America* (Cambridge, 1952), 480. Concerning the Year Book Issue, Gannett commented, "...I'm glad about the Year Book, though it's but a step towards the real question. Of course only a step at a time can be taken. It isn't necessary that 'Unitarianism' sh'd be the name of the best thing in religion, but whether or not it is to be, depends, I take it, on the question whether it is willing to be the name of a religion that is non-Xⁿ as well as Xⁿ and non-Theistic as well as Theistic,—a religion whose Trinity shall be Science, Ethics & Worship, but the greatest of these—Ethics." William C. Gannett to Charles W. Wendte, January 19, 1884, WCG. Despite the Year Book settlement, Potter continued to insist that Unitarianism remained restrictive because it still included the term "Christianity." The only solution to the problem, he concluded, was to make the National Conference Constitution completely open by eliminating the term "Christianity," and by recognizing that "first, freedom of thought is an inherent and inalienable right of the human mind; [and] second, uprightness of character is an aim in life that has precedence over all theological creeds." William J. Potter, "The Unitarian National Conference and Mental Liberty," *Index*, n.s. V (May 7, 1885), 535-7.
37. William C. Gannett to John W. Chadwick, December 12, 1885, WCG.
38. William C. Gannett, "What is Unitarianism?" (MS Sermon #282, February 25, 1883), WCG-CR.
39. [William C. Gannett], "Why W.C.G. Gives Our Best Words God-Speed," *Our Best Words*, VI (January, 1885), 6-7.
40. William C. Gannett, "The Honest Creed," *Unity*, XV (March 7, 1885), 4-5.
41. William C. Gannett, "What Makes a Unitarian?" *Unity*, XVI (January 23, 1886), 258-61.
42. William C. Gannett, "A Symposium of One Concerning Things Uncertain," *Unity*, XVI (February 13, 1886), 295-7.
43. Editorial, "As Free as You Please, But Still Churches," *Unitarian*, I (March, 1886), 60-2.
44. William C. Gannett, "Not in Ill-Will," *Unity*, XVII (March 20, 1886), 32-4.
45. Jabez T. Sunderland, *The Issue in the West* (n.p., 1886).
46. "Report of Rev. J. T. Sunderland, Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference," *Unity*, XVII (June 5, 1886), 192-6.
47. For the various resolutions see William C. Gannett, "Western Unitarian Conference," *Unity*, XVII (May 22, 1886), 161-4; "Annual Meeting, the Western Unitarian Conference," *Unitarian*, I (June, 1886), 167-9; "Report of the Proceedings of the Thirty-second Annual Meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference," *Unity*, XVII (June 5, 1886), 205-7; and William C. Gannett, "Mr. Sunderland's Issue in the West," *Unity*, XVII (May 29, 1886), 173-6. In this last article Gannett quoted the Sunderland resolution as saying, "Resolved, that while opposing all creeds as tests of fellowship, we deem it proper to declare that the Western Unitarian Conference, as a body, stands for and represents faith in one God, in immortality, in worship, and in personal righteousness as exemplified in the example and teaching of Jesus Christ." In the "Proceedings," however, the form was given. "Resolved, That while opposing all creeds or creed limitations, the Western Unitarian Conference hereby declares its purpose as a body to be the promotion of a religion of love to God and love to man." The *Unitarian* account also gave the longer form. All accounts agree, however, that, whichever form was actually voted on, the Sunderland resolution lost by a vote of 34 to 20.
48. Gannett, "Western Unitarian Conference," 161-4. See also "Report of the Proceedings," 205-7.
49. James T. Bixby to Samuel J. Barrows, June 9, 1886, WCG. See also Lyttle, *Freedom Moves West*, 185, on the compromise issue. Gannett's second and third resolutions were defeated by a 20-24 vote; the first passed by a vote of 34 to 10.
50. Gannett, "Western Unitarian Conference," 161-4.

51. The preceding characterization is based upon two letters which the moderately conservative Rev. Arthur M. Judy of Davenport, Iowa, wrote to Gannett, June 4 and [?], 1886, WCG.
52. Charles W. Wendte to Samuel J. Barrows, June 3, 1886, WCG. Wendte was a liberal and life-long friend of Gannett, although they broke deeply and personally during the Western Controversy. Having been pastor in Cincinnati and Chicago for thirteen years, and having been one of the original founders of *Unity*, he was thoroughly acquainted with the liberal position. See *Dictionary of American Biography* (New York, 1936), XIX, 651-2; also Charles W. Wendte, *The Wider Fellowship, Memories, Friendships, and Endeavors for Religious Unity* (Boston, 1927).
53. Charles G. Ames to Samuel J. Barrows, May 28, 1886, WCG.
54. Isabel C. Barrows [Mrs. Samuel J.] to William C. Gannett, June 19, 1886, WCG.
55. Sylvan S. Hunting to Samuel J. Barrows, [ca. June, 1886], WCG. Hunting for years had been an active liberal missionary and pastor in the Midwest. His liberalism was indicated, for example, by his membership in the Free Religious Association. See Cooke, *Unitarianism in America*, 214; and Lyttle, *Freedom Moves West*, 133.
56. William C. Gannett to Samuel J. Barrows, June 4, 1886, WCG.
57. Quoted (no source cited) in Lyttle, *Freedom Moves West*, 186. Among the leading conservatives who went into the W.U.A. were Joseph Shippen, who resigned as President of the W.U.C.; John Snyder of St. Louis, Albert Walkeley of Manistee, Michigan, and Jabez T. Sunderland of Chicago, all of whom resigned as Directors of the W.U.C.; also James T. Bixby of Ann Arbor, Oscar Clute of Iowa City, Jasper L. Douthit of Shelbyville, Illinois, and A. G. Jennings of La Porte, Indiana. Clute was missionary for Iowa, Minnesota, and Dakota; and Jennings was state missionary for Indiana and an ex-Secretary of the W.U.C. These men and others, less important, are listed in "Some Events and Utterances Since the Conference," *Unitarian*, I (June, 1886), 146-8; and "Western Unitarian Association," *Our Best Words*, VII (July 31, 1886), 3. See also Lyttle, *Freedom Moves West*, 186. Sunderland listed those whom he considered the principal liberal-ethical leaders in descending order as William C. Gannett, Jenkin Lloyd Jones, John Learned, James V. Blake, John Effinger, Mrs. Leonard, T. B. Forbush, Henry M. Simmons, and J. H. Crooker. Jabez T. Sunderland to Howard N. Brown, September 14, 1886, Howard N. Brown Papers, Meadville Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois (hereafter cited as HNB). Wilbur called the W.U.A. scarcely more than a paper organization, *Unitarianism in Transylvania, England, and America*, 483-4; whereas, though factually correct, from the role it played during the next eight years, this seems like an ungenerous understatement.
58. James T. Bixby to Samuel J. Barrows, June 4, 1886, WCG.
59. [Jasper L. Douthit], "Peace, Peace, When There is no Peace," *Our Best Words*, VII (May 22, 1886), 2.
60. [Jasper L. Douthit], "An Atheistic Platform," *Our Best Words*, VII (May 22, 1886), 1.
61. "The Issue in the West, in Brief," *Unitarian*, I (September, 1886), 248-9. Brooke Herford contended, "Liberty Gone Wild," *Unitarian*, I (July, 1886), 184-5, that "to contend that 'liberty' requires the pulpit to be equally [as] open [as lay fellowship] is simply nonsense. It is equivalent to maintaining that in a college any one who is admissible as a student is also fit to be recognized as a professor, or that any one who is allowed to enlist in an army is therefore eligible for command." John Snyder held that "if the Conference would abandon its executive & missionary function & become a religious & theological Institute I should be delighted & profited with its meetings. But I do not believe it can create new churches upon the basis of a platform from which all religious purpose has been bleached." John Snyder to William C. Gannett, May 3, 1886, WCG.
62. Frederick L. Hosmer to Samuel J. Barrows, May 22, 1886, WCG.
63. Jenkin Lloyd Jones to Samuel J. Barrows, May 16, 1886, WCG. See also Jones to Barrows, June 3, 1886, WCG.
64. *Christian Register*, LXV (May 20, 1886), 305-6. For a further comment on the achievement of the Cincinnati convention see *Christian Register*, LXV (May 27, 1886), 321.
65. "Report of the Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference," *Unity*, XIX (June 4 and 11, 1887), 188-92. This is from an open letter of the Directors of the W.U.C. explaining the Cincinnati basis, written July 27, 1886. It was included in the 1887 "Report." Seven years later John Learned called the Cincinnati resolution the first victory for pure transcendentalism in all religious history; John Learned, "Post-Transcendental Unitarianism," *Unity*, XXXII (October 12, 1893), 83-91. For two viciously caustic but witty assessments of the conservatives, see James V. Blake to Samuel J. Bar-

- rows, May 28, 1886; and Blake to William C. Gannett, March 3, 1887, both in WCG. group of middle-roads led by T. B. Forbush, all of whom Sunderland considered more anathematic even than Gannett, declared a plague on both houses, putting their faith in A.U.A.—state conference co-operation. T. B. Forbush to Samuel J. Barrows, June 28, 1886, WCG; and Jabez T. Sunderland to Howard N. Brown, November 4, 1886, HNB.
66. William C. Gannett to Samuel J. Barrows, May 21, [1886], WCG. See also Gannett to John W. Chadwick, May 26, WCG.
 67. William C. Gannett to Samuel J. Barrows, June 4 and 12, 1886, WCG.
 68. William C. Gannett to Samuel J. Barrows, June 4, 1886. See also draft copy, William C. Gannett to Samuel Greeley, June 15, 1886, WCG.
 69. William C. Gannett, "Mr. Sunderland's Issue in the West...", *Unity*, XVII (May 29, 1886), 173-6. See also Gannett, "How They Captured the W.U.C.—Mr. Herford's 'Real Story' Made More Real," *Unity*, XVII (July 10, 1886), 274-6, in which Gannett calls Sunderland's "Issue in the West" "a wedge deliberately set in all the churches"; and Gannett's summary of William C. Gannett to Henry M. Simmons, June 17, 1886, WCG.
 70. The preceding analysis is from William C. Gannett to Samuel J. Barrows, June 4, 1886, WCG.
 71. Cooke, *Unitarianism in America*, 226-7. Samuel J. Barrows to William C. Gannett, July 14, 1886, WCG.
 72. Samuel J. Barrows to William C. Gannett, July 14, 1886, WCG.
 73. John C. Learned to William C. Gannett, July 14, 1886, WCG. Albert Walkeley to Howard N. Brown, October 11 and 30, 1886, HNB. Jabez T. Sunderland to Howard N. Brown, November 4, 1886, HNB. John R. Effinger to William C. Gannett, August 5, 1886, WCG. In a letter to Howard N. Brown, [probably November-December, 1886], HNB, Effinger was less optimistic: "Loyalty to the A.U.A. has been regarded by the friends and dependents of the A.U.A. as entirely precluding sympathy and cooperation with the W.U.C.... It is eastern rather than western unfriendliness which has given us most anxiety."
 74. William C. Gannett, "Our Twin Unitarian Superstitions," *Unity*, XVII (August 28, 1886), 357-60.
 75. "Notes on the Western Situation," *Unitarian*, I (September, 1886), 235-6.
 76. This was the gist of a resolution to be presented by the liberals at the forthcoming convention. Jones and Blake reportedly agreed to it "a little reluctantly," and Gannett, it was reported, "is so opposed that he will endeavor to have it suppressed." T. B. Forbush to Howard N. Brown, March 7, 1887, HNB.
 77. This was the gist of a resolution to be presented by the middle-roads at the forthcoming convention. T. B. Forbush to Howard N. Brown, March 7, 1887, HNB.
 78. William C. Gannett, "Things Most Commonly Believed," *Unity*, XIX (April 9, 1887), 77-9. Gannett had also suggested that even the 1886 resolution might be too binding and rigid, at least appearing "coercive by seeming to require freedom, for which not all are ready yet." He had therefore suggested an addition to the 1886 resolution "as will make it only the thought of the majority, binding on none, and always open to revision." William C. Gannett, "Cincinnati Resolution—Was it Un-Congregational?" *Unity*, XIX (April 2, 1887), 64-6. Even at this early date in the Western Controversy, Gannett felt weary, tired, and exhausted. This was his first experience with any sort of personal antagonisms and recriminations, and he confided that "pretty much all the pleasure of this general western work has been for the present destroyed"; and that if things got any worse he would "probably counsel yielding of everything but the principles involved, & withdraw from active interest." William C. Gannett to Mary T. Lewis, April 5, 1887, LSG.
 79. John C. Learned to William C. Gannett, April 19, 1887, WCG.
 80. "Report of the Proceedings of the Thirty-third Annual Meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference," *Unity*, XIX (June 4 and 11, 1887), 199-201. William C. Gannett to Mary T. Lewis, May 20, 1887, LSG.
 81. William C. Gannett, *The Things Most Commonly Believed Today Among Us* (n.p., n.d.); also printed as *Unity Short Tract #17* (Chicago, n.d.).
 82. T. B. Forbush to Howard N. Brown, January 10, 1887, HNB.
 83. The preceding from Samuel J. Barrows to William C. Gannett, March 5, 1887, WCG.
 84. Samuel J. Barrows to William C. Gannett, March 19, 1887, WCG.
 85. Draft copy, William C. Gannett to Samuel J. Barrows, March 15, 1887, WCG.
 86. William C. Gannett to Mary T. Lewis, May 1, 1887, LSG.
 87. William C. Gannett to Mary T. Lewis, May 1, 1887, LSG. Sylvan S. Hunting thought that there was "little hope of union." See [Mrs.] C. T. Cole to William C. Gannett, May 2, 1887, WCG.
 88. William C. Gannett to Sylvan S. Hunt-

ing [missent to W. R. Cole and returned to Gannett], May 11, 1887, WCG.

89. "Report of the Proceedings of the Thirty-third Annual Meeting of the Western Unitarian Conference," *Unity*, XIX (June 4 and 11, 1887), 337.
90. *Christian Register*, LXVI (June 2, 1887), 337.
91. *Unitarian*, II (November, 1887), 259, from an installation sermon delivered by David Utter.
92. "Is the Proposed Ethical Basis for Unitarianism Dishonest?" *Unitarian*, IV (November, 1889), 502-3.
93. John Snyder, "A New Dictionary," *Unitarian*, V (July, 1890), 346-7.
94. During this period Gannett broke personally with Jasper Douthit, and, more importantly, with Charles W. Wendte. See, in particular, Gannett's letter to Wendte, June 3, 1886, and two replies, June 10 and August 2, 1886, all in WCG; and Jasper L. Douthit to William C. Gannett, July 12, 1888, and Gannett's draft reply, July 16, 1888, both in WCG. "We are a much shattered little body, our Western Conference," Gannett wrote to Mary E. Rice (May 1, 1888, LSG). Furthermore, a resolution of friendship adopted by the W.U.C. toward the A.U.A. in the spring of 1887 and reciprocated produced no improvement in East-West relations. The A.U.A. sent its own agents to work in the West: 1887, George Batchelor; 1888, George W. Cutter; and 1890-6, T. B. Forbush. See *A.U.A. Report* (1887), 6-7. Kate G. Wells to William C. Gannett, January 18 and 19, 1888, LSG.
95. William C. Gannett to Jenkin Lloyd Jones, April 23, 1889, WCG.
96. William C. Gannett to Jenkin Lloyd Jones, November 23, 1889, WCG.
97. From a printed preliminary brochure, dated September 18, 1890, and issued by J. H. Crooker, WCG.
98. John Effinger to William C. Gannett, September 2, 1890, WCG.
99. William C. Gannett to Jenkin Lloyd Jones, November 8, 1890, WCG. Gannett held the A.U.A. largely responsible for the impasse reached by 1890 because of its sympathy toward the W.U.A. and because of its hesitation and procrastination.
100. For the A.U.A. position see Grindall Reynolds to William C. Gannett, November 21, 1889; Howard N. Brown to Editor of *Unity*, February 16, 1891; Howard N. Brown to William C. Gannett, February 23, 1891; and Howard N. Brown to William C. Gannett, March 10, 1891, all in WCG. A split similar to that between the A.U.A. and the W.U.C. occurred between

tions. At the National Conference convention in Philadelphia in 1889, the eastern women had formed the National Alliance of Unitarian and Other Liberal Christian Women, which the Women's Western Unitarian Conference had expected to join. Opposition, however, developed over the word "Christian" and the West decided to remain aloof. In addition it had failed to fulfill an agreement to disband as had been tacitly agreed upon earlier. The details of the controversy are a complicated story in themselves, the threads of which can be followed in *A.U.A. Report* (1890), 31-8; William C. Gannett, "National Unitarian Conference," (MS Sermon #371, n.d.), WCG-CR; E.A.W., "The Women's Conference," *Unity*, XXV (May 17, 1890), 95; "Report of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Women's Western Unitarian Conference," *Unity*, XXVII (May 21, 1891), 106-7; also scattered correspondence, 1889-1891, in WCG. Gannett's defense of the western position was that "the simple fact, as it seems to me, is that the spirit wh. tried & failed in Cincinnati, tried & succeeded in Phila. The very position that Mr. Sunderland was after—making a name essential to Unitarianism—has been taken by the Alliance... the narrow name, the sectarian fellowship was made the *sine qua non* of the Alliance: by the very name.... Evangelical X^{ns}, Ethical Culture women, Jews, Agnostics are all shut out." William C. Gannett to John W. Chadwick, February 26, 1890, WCG.

101. William C. Gannett to Howard N. Brown, March 28, 1891, HNB.
102. William C. Gannett to Howard N. Brown, March 28, 1891, HNB.
103. William C. Gannett to Frederick L. Hosmer, December 19, 1892, WCG. FLH is Hosmer, at the time Western Conference Secretary; GW is George W. Fox, Assistant Secretary of the A.U.A.; JLG is Jenkin Lloyd Jones.
104. William C. Gannett to Samuel J. Barrows, August 2, 1891, WCG.
105. "Thirty-eighth Annual Session of the Western Unitarian Conference, May 17-20, 1892," *Unity*, XXIX (May 26, 1892), 105. Also quoted with variations in an editorial, "Union in the West" *Unitarian*, VII (June, 1892), 280-2.
106. "Thirty-eighth Annual Session of the Western Unitarian Conference, May 17-20, 1892," *Unity*, XXIX (May 26, 1892), 105, gives the vote as 42-47. Sunderland, in a hand-written note, put the vote at 44-27, HNR.
107. William C. Gannett, "A Dimmed Ideal," *Unity*, XXIX (June 16, 1892), 129-30.
108. *Ibid.*, XXIX, 129-30.

109. William C. Gannett to Frederick L. Hosmer, April 24, 1893, WCG.
110. William C. Gannett to Frederick L. Hosmer, June 11 and 25, 1892, WCG. Gannett, however, did not drop out of the Conference; William C. Gannett to Jenkin Lloyd Jones, September 8, 1892, WCG.
111. William C. Gannett to Jenkin Lloyd Jones, January 20, 1893, WCG. In this same letter Gannett also wrote "You will try to convert the Conf. back to the higher position: my part is comparatively a small matter, but I shall simply accept the verdict & withdraw. I fought for the Conference while it stood for that 1886 position; I am not going to fight *against* the Conference even for *the* position,—there are other ways *of* serving that." Jones, however, never accepted the verdict, and this was the beginning of the theological break between him and Gannett.
112. "Proceedings of the Thirty-ninth Annual Session of the Western Unitarian Conference," *Unity*, XXXI (May 25 and June 1, 1893), 119-20.
113. *National Conference Report* (1894), 19-20.
114. *Ibid.*, 20-2. At 2:30 the convention formally voted to put the revised Article VIII in the Preamble.
115. *Ibid.*, 22-5. Edward E. Hale, "The Unitarian Conference," *Outlook*, L (October 6, 1894), 558-9. "Our National Conference," *Unitarian*, IX (October, 1894), 456-9.
116. William C. Gannett to Mary E. Rice, October 9, 1894, LSG.
117. Mary T. L. Gannett, *Diary* (1894), September 26, WCG.

THE SOCIAL GOSPEL AND THE TRUST-BUSTERS

ROBERT R. ROBERTS, *Mankato State Teachers College*

By 1878 the United States stood on the verge of a period of immense consolidation and concentration of business wealth. Already the process was underway by means of pools and marketing agreements, and the powerful "trusts" were in the immediate future.¹ By the turn of the century the characteristic feature of American business was the giant corporation, built on holding companies and interlocking directorates. The existence of such great wealth and power in the hands of a relatively few men posed a question for the interpreters of Christian ethics, and the answers ranged all the way from an idealistic communism to the benefits of stewardship.

The various positive reactions to the urban industrial challenge have been placed by Henry F. May into three groups as follows: conservative social Christianity; progressive social Christianity; and a radical, Christian Socialist movement.² The conservative social Christians may be described as those who were aware that new responsibilities had devolved upon the leaders of society, but were content to recommend the amelioration of distress through philanthropy and charitable works. On the other extreme were the radicals who preached the need of a fundamental change in the political and economic organization as a Christian duty. The middle group is that from which the subjects of this study have been drawn, and the term "social gospel" will be used throughout to refer to this group. The particular ministers used as examples were from prominent city pulpits or held important editorial posts; all of whom published frequently in journals and books and may be considered leaders of important minorities within their respective denominations. In general, these progressive social Christians were neither wholly satisfied with existing practices in the political and economic life of the nation, nor were they prepared as Christians to advocate revolutionary changes.

This paper deals with only one area of their thought, that of the dangers of monopoly capitalism. The published works of these men revealed, of course, a wide range of social concerns, from the problem of the dispossessed Indians to the evils of urban slums, and from the issues of local government to the far-flung problems confronting a youthful world power; but to demonstrate their clear-cut contribution to American progressivism there is no better area than their critique of monopoly capitalism, as this critique evolved in the years, 1875 to 1900; before the issue was dramatized by the "trust-busting" activities of "Teddy" Roosevelt.

The first tentative steps taken in this direction came in the mid-seventies, during the depression years following the panic of 1873. In 1874-5 an Episcopalian clergyman, R. Heber Newton, prepared and delivered a series of lectures on *The Morals of Trade*, which were published in book form in 1876. These lectures serve as a good illustration of the caution exhibited by churchmen in their approach to economic problems. The only concrete proposal embodied in this work was an appeal for honesty in business. Yet, in the approach, in some of the language, and in some of the criticisms, there were indications of the future social gospel program.

Newton was especially concerned about the prevalence of the speculative mania, a constant bogey of the social gospel. He carefully drew the distinctions between legitimate speculation and simple gambling on the market. Genuine or legitimate speculation, thought Newton, was characterized by the following features: "personal investment, calculable risk, justifiable security, public improvement."³ This separation of speculation for profit alone, and investment in worthy enterprises remained the normative prescription with which future preachers of the social gospel approached the problem of the stock market and commodity exchange.

In particular Newton castigated the prevalent methods of railroad operations. His words are worth quoting:

The huge railroad corporations of the country, created by law for the public convenience as highways of travel and trade, from their commanding positions of power have become the points of attack of our boldest speculators; and in notorious instances have been seized by these robber barons of our century, and used simply as the castles of their prototypes along the Rhine, to levy blackmail upon traffic.⁴

The emphasis here on the public nature of the railroads is an early example of the thinking that led the social gospel leaders to the idea of "natural monopolies," which must be owned or controlled by the state in the public interest.

Though the prescriptions for reform may have been vague and incoherent, the fear of corporate power and influence was clearly expressed. Newton felt that the titans of business, especially the railroad operators, were exercising an undue and malignant influence on the nation. By means of fraud—watered stock, dividends paid on loans, and inflated values—a "controlling clique" was warring upon the defenseless citizenry, "leaving behind them a dark wake of ruin."⁵ Such, thought Newton, was the real significance of the economic crisis of the 1870's, and he attributed it almost wholly to the influence of the speculative craze.

In analyzing the causes lying behind these complex economic problems, Newton showed little originality or understanding. The two factors that he emphasized, aside from the "weakness and wickedness of man," were the prime political issues of the time: political corrup-

tion and inflated paper currency. According to Newton, paper money of fluctuating value bred immorality in trade. It tempted men, nurtured in the corruption and easy morality of the Grant administrations, to gamble for quick profits at the expense of public service. So Newton called for an end to the spoils system, which he felt was the basic cause of corruption in government, and the establishment of a stabilized currency. As long as speculation was condoned in public servants and a fluctuating money tempted gamblers, he saw no hope for the elimination of cheating in the marts of trade.

In Springfield, Massachusetts, the Congregational clergyman, Washington Gladden, found himself addressing meetings of unemployed workmen during the years 1875 and 1876. In so doing, he was forced to observe the effects of depression on the laboring people, and perhaps because of this experience he began to turn his attention to social problems. Before he was through he had surely earned the title of the "Father of the Social Gospel," and the position of its most influential spokesman.

However, in these first lectures there was little hint of the analytical powers and clarity of thought which he would eventually bring to political and economic problems. At this time Gladden's words gave less evidence of understanding the nature of the new industrial order than was apparent in Newton's *Morals of Trade*. Beyond the fact that he admitted the existence of a "labor problem," and that it was a moral problem as well as an economic one, he contributed little that the most conservative of industrial leaders would not have admitted to be the case.

His analysis of the depression was much like Newton's; assessing the blame to over-expansion in industry and a fluctuating currency. But he added to these the waste of war, its resultant debts, and "extravagant living."⁶ His solutions were even more simple. He advised the workers to go back to the farms, to practice thrift and frugality and hard work. For governmental interference in the economy, Gladden, at this time, had no patience. He quoted Herbert Spencer on the inefficiency of government operations and the evil of state activity in the business world.⁷ The only action he asked of the federal government was the stabilization of the currency.

Neither Newton nor Gladden had thought deeply or critically of the economic clichés of their time. These lectures were tentative moves, giving as yet only a few hints of the direction of social gospel thought. Not at this time, or ever, did social gospel clerics seriously question the ideals of democratic individualism. As can be seen in these early works, criticism of the excesses of laissez-faire capitalism did not imply an attack on the system itself.

Unquestionably these two men were reacting to the Panic of '73

and the exposures of graft and corruption in the national government. They addressed themselves particularly to the paper currency question and rejected the programs of the Greenback party and the nascent Populist parties of the western states. In the case of these two pioneers of the social gospel the direction of their thought was not in accord with the groups advocating the issuance of more paper money. They did not blame the depression on the short supply of money in the economy; they stood with the Republican party in demanding the resumption of specie payments and a firmly established gold standard.

Another voice from the pulpit was heard in Cincinnati, Ohio, expressing similar ideas. This was Dudley Ward Rhodes, Rector of the Church of Our Savior. The Reverend D. W. Rhodes told his listeners, in a series of lectures delivered in 1878-9, that the time had come for the church in America to face the fundamental questions of the economic and social order. It was no longer sufficient for the church to produce "fine essays on Evolution and Protoplasm" or "long and elaborate arguments on Resurrection and Predestination."⁸ Consequently, he wrote, "I have prepared these lectures on especial forms of misery and crime, and delivered them with the firm conviction that there is a legitimate and binding demand on the pulpit to call attention to great social disorders and official frauds and mercantile dishonesty . . ."⁹

Once again attention was called to the great fortunes built on shaky credit structures and to the danger inherent in highly speculative enterprises, or as Rhodes chose to label them, "colossal . . . social shams." But, as in the case of Newton and Gladden, the primary appeal of Rhodes was for honesty and fair dealing. He devoted the majority of his time to the errant debtors of grocery stores, adulteration of foods, dishonest tax returns, corruption in politics, and the dangers of immorality in the theater.

Another example of the very tentative approach to the problem of wealth and the social order was that of Bishop Henry Cadman Potter, later one of the most influential progressives in the Episcopal Church. Bishop Potter delivered to the parishioners of Grace Church, New York, in 1878, a sermon on "The Perils of Wealth." For Potter, great wealth was a potential danger; in the hands of evil men it could do incalculable harm, but in the hands of men with a sense of divine stewardship wealth could bring great benefits to the community and the nation.¹⁰

During this early period, then, the men who were developing the ideas of progressive social Christianity were becoming aware of serious problems created by the concentration of wealth. The vision of the prosperous Republic emerging from the Civil War was revealed to have some defects, but as yet there appeared no realistic analysis of

the economic forces at work or practical remedies for the worst of the evils. To be sure, wealth was being misused, a few were enlarging their fortunes at the expense of the many, but the answer to this was still couched in the language of purely individual responsibility. Nor did these spokesmen as yet envisage the extent of the drive to combination and concentration of business, and the problem of the responsibility of the state in balancing this power.

A few years later, in 1885, the most spectacular avowedly social gospel book of the entire movement was published. Josiah Strong's *Our Country* was the one truly popular non-fiction work of the social Christian type. It has been placed by the foremost student of American best-sellers, Frank Luther Mott, as one of the better sellers in a decade which included such popular non-fiction books as Edward Bellamy's *Looking Backward* and Henry George's *Progress and Poverty*.¹¹

Strong was concerned about the "perils" which threatened American society. When named, most of them turned out, rather anti-climactically, to be the usual fears of middle-class Protestant America. They were: immigration, Romanism, Mormonism, intemperance, and socialism; all perfectly acceptable threats to the most narrow-minded American chauvinist. But one of the "perils" was directly related to the growing criticism from the pulpit of the trend toward monopoly.¹²

Strong chose to describe this as the "peril of mammonism," pointing out that by making money the chief object of life, the American people were creating an aristocracy of wealth. This encouraged men to use any methods, gambling on stock exchanges, purveying vice, or corrupting the ballot box to attain their end. In particular, he feared that the "congestion of wealth," the concentration of business power in the hands of a few men, was dangerous to popular institutions. The "money-king" was out of place in a republic of limited powers, because he was an "irresponsible power."¹³ Further instances of Strong's warnings of the perils of the concentration of wealth could be added but would serve no useful purpose. His views on this topic deviated little from the earlier ideas expressed by Newton and Gladden. His contribution was not in substantial analysis but in popularization.

When it came time to recommend positive action to allay this threat to civilization, Strong fell back on the idea of divine stewardship. True, he called for a new, "radically different conception" of the relationship of man to his property; but on close examination it appeared not so "radically different." According to Strong, since God has absolute ownership in all his creatures, man can have absolute ownership in nothing whatever. The upshot of this was not an attack on private property, for the rights of property still held in the relation-

ships of men, but that property should be employed in the way "that would best honor God."¹⁴

Among the earliest to recognize clearly the development of corporate power and the political issues raised was Lyman Abbott, Congregationalist and editor of the influential journal, *The Christian Union*. This awareness in Abbott's thinking can be traced at least as far back as the mid-1880's, when he first began to realize that the American capitalistic system was not without its imperfections. In 1885 he contributed an article to *The Century Magazine* in which he came to grips with the problem of the increasing inequality in wealth and the responsibility of society for this state of affairs.

Abbott was prepared to face the issue squarely. The laboring men have a legitimate complaint, he wrote, and the progress of class doctrines was a product of the despotism of capital. The concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a few men had been taking place, and he plainly implied that this dangerous process would continue by describing these early monopolists as the "vanguard of attack."¹⁵

It would seem worthwhile to quote at length Abbott's views on corporate power, to show how clearly he anticipated the charges of future progressives, muck-rakers, and the Populists of the 1892 platform:

These corporations are already a power in the state greater than the state itself. They have control of the United States Senate if not the United States House of Representatives, and the legislatures of several of our States. They have autocratic powers bestowed on them. They fix the rates of transportation of goods and passengers; they determine the conditions on which and the prices at which telegraphic communications may be carried on between different parts of the country; they are absolute master both of the nerves and the arteries of the body politic. The combined wealth of the railroad corporations counts by billions; their annual incomes by hundreds of millions; their interests are combined in pools and syndicates. Against them private citizens are almost powerless; the workman must take what work they will give; the shipper must pay what freights they charge. If any complaint is made, the complainant is recommended to go elsewhere; as if one syndicate should control the globe, and a complaining citizen would be told to try his fortunes on some other planet.¹⁶

Now that he had stated the problem, how did Abbott propose to ameliorate the situation? In the same article he recommended a two point program which remained as the core of his thinking throughout this period, and was accepted by most social gospel preachers. The first suggestion was for labor to join in stock-ownership or other profit sharing plans, leading to what he called "cooperative production." The second step toward his conception of "industrial democracy" involved a "new conception of the functions of government and consequent enlargement of its powers, and the sphere of its opera-

tions."¹⁷ Abbott rejected the arguments of proponents of laissez-faire, holding that their ideas were but a modern version of the old Jeffersonian ideal of the best government as that which governs least. He described these theories as "organic selfishness," and in place of them called for a government which would be a "league of men combined . . . for the better reward of its industry, the better promotion of welfare."¹⁸

It was plain that behind Abbott's "new conception" of government lay his fear of the concentration of power over transportation and communications in the hands of a few private citizens. The three examples which he used in support of his theories dealt with these key enterprises. They were the government-operated telegraph system in Great Britain, the administration of the Erie Canal by the State of New York, and the operation of the railroads by the government of Belgium. In addition to these Abbott pointed out the increasingly important role of the United States government in the banking system. In all cases he thought the results justified the idea of government intervention in certain limited but crucial areas of the economy.

Thus, by 1885, Lyman Abbott had seriously considered the problem of concentrated wealth and power. He recognized the trend toward further combination. He saw that such economic power had to invade the political sphere in order to insure its own existence through favorable tariffs, subsidies, and, most importantly, a laissez-faire policy in government. As his answer Abbott bluntly proposed that the government assume responsibility for the protection of the people against these vast agglomerations of wealth and power. In certain key industries the stake of the public was too high to permit control to fall into the hands of a few men. Soon other spokesmen of the social gospel would be calling these key industries "natural monopolies" and follow Abbott in insisting that the public, through the federal government, either own or supervise these industries. The first major step in the development of the moderate reform program of social Christianity had been taken.

It was apparent that the depression years of 1884-5 were having an effect on the growth of social gospel literature, and this effect becomes even clearer when one notes the way in which their critique began to concentrate on the railroads. The attempts at state regulation, most common in the west, had obviously failed to correct the abuses in rail rates. The problem was a national one, as Abbott had insisted in his 1885 article. The social gospel spokesmen, however, were not the leaders in this movement. The halls of Congress had seen the introduction of legislation for federal supervision of railroad practices as early as 1878; in 1880 the Mississippi legislature asked Congress to act on the regulation of transportation charges; and in

1883 Chester A. Arthur, in a presidential message, spoke out for the principle of federal regulation.¹⁹

In 1886, while Congress debated the issue, the Reverend George C. Lorimer of the Immanuel Baptist Church, Chicago, Illinois, published a series of lectures entitled *Studies in Social Life*. While excoriating all legislation that favored a small group or class, Lorimer selected for special attention the treatment of the railroads. Without identifying the source of his statistics, he estimated that Congress had granted to the railroads 215,000,000 acres, and the State of Texas had added to this a grant of 38,457,600 acres—in round numbers a total of 255,000,000 acres. To quote his comment on this:

Phew, it takes one's breath away! To think of such vast tracts of land, such principalities and empire being voted away by a handful of men in Washington, such wholesale squandering of the patrimony of unborn generations . . . The people have been despoiled. They have been robbed . . . for the special benefit of some five companies, which in turn are controlled by not more than twenty-five men.²⁰

As far as Lorimer was concerned the land-grant scheme was a total failure. The land should have gone into small holdings and, though the railroads might not have been built as rapidly, the nation would have avoided the evils of the speculative crazes and consequent depressions.

Lorimer's arraignment of the methods of railroad building, of their management, and their effect on the western farmer would have done justice to any member of a Farmer's Alliance or a Grange. He charged that the roads had been built at the expense of the public, that they had profited from the sale of public lands, that they had watered stock to increase profits, and, finally, they made possible the creation of the huge bonanza farms at the expense of the independent small holder.²¹

Like Abbott, Lorimer was willing to consider the idea that in some cases state supervision might be desirable. If individual resources should be inadequate the government should superintend the private corporation, but wherever possible such a step should be avoided. He did not believe that government administration of the railroads—or telegraph, gas, and water supplies—would necessarily be a serious threat to American liberties, but he did think that all other expedients should be tried first.

For the immediate situation Lorimer recommended that where the railroads had not fulfilled their commitments the public lands should be repossessed by the federal government. And from that time forward, he suggested much closer supervision by the government of the division of stock and jealous guarding of the charters issued—"in other words, instead of the State undertaking to carry out every last enterprise which heretofore has been managed by combinations of

citizens, let us see to it that such charters are granted to corporations as will prevent them ever becoming the private property of one or two wealthy schemers, and let her energetically compel them to fulfill the compact they have entered into."²²

At the same time that Lorimer was delivering his critique of railroad pools and other monopolies, *The Christian Union* was dealing with similar issues. In January, 1886, it gave its editorial support to the bill creating an Interstate Commerce Commission—introduced by Senator Shelby M. Cullom of Illinois. Without commenting on the adequacy of the specific provisions of this proposed measure, the editorial firmly supported the principle of government regulation: "It is clear that railroad transportation has passed beyond the stage in which it can be left to be regulated by private interests and free competition."²³

The movement toward federal regulation of the railroads was given further impetus by the Supreme Court decision in the case of *Wabash, St. Louis and Pacific Railway v. Illinois*. State regulation of interstate commerce was declared unconstitutional, leaving federal action the only recourse for those advocating regulation. This decision was approved by *The Christian Union*, largely because it placed the responsibility directly on Congress for either general laws on railroad commerce or creation of an Interstate Commerce Commission.²⁴

The passage of the interstate commerce law, February 4, 1887, momentarily satisfied the demands of the social gospel spokesmen, as it did, on the whole, most moderate reformers. Not until a later date did these critics of railroad practices realize the weakness of the bill, the lack of adequate enforcement measures, and return to the demand for effective supervision—even nationalization, if necessary.

Another forthright criticism of the effects of the trend to monopoly was put forward in 1886 by the Baptist clergyman, T. Edwin Brown. Brown centered his argument around the socialist indictment of capitalistic society. In a manner of speaking, he assumed the role of the devil's advocate. He pointed to the concentration of capital, the "huge and overbearing" monopolies through which a few men controlled the essential industries, railroads, mines, oil, and manufactures, "to rob the consumer and divide the spoils." He accused these powerful interests of corrupting judges, legislators, and governors, and of gambling on stock exchanges with "the blood and brains, the very virtues, homes and hopes of millions."²⁵

In sober and restrained words, Brown demonstrated real understanding of the powerful pressures behind economic combinations, and the dangers of such combinations. He saw that few questions which faced modern society were as complex and significant as the growth

of monopoly. In certain industries—transportation, communication, or heavy manufacturing—bigness appeared as a natural development, and only through concentration of capital could such industries be maintained. But, he cautioned his readers, such concentrations of wealth and power can become the instruments of “arrogant, selfish, oppressive” men, and need to be closely watched and restrained.

As to what restraints should be employed, Brown was unequivocal. The free competition of the market-place, so prized by classical economists, was insufficient. Wherever a combination appeared to be taking advantage of its position, the government should take action. In general, “vested interests” which become oppressive, or in any way threaten the public good, should be controlled by the state.²⁶

Brown thus joined Abbott and Lorimer in recognizing the responsibility of the state in the area of economic endeavor. The social gospel had taken a long step from the hesitant criticisms of its earliest leaders and was now prepared to join with the forces of progressivism that were stirring in the last decade of the 19th century. The literature of protest that had been appearing in the 1880's grew in volume and influence, and along with it the social gospel. The pioneer work of Henry George and Edward Bellamy, the agitation of Greenbackism, the Grange, Farmer's Alliances, and the Knights of Labor had helped prepare the soil for the efforts of Bryan, Roosevelt, LaFollette, and Wilson. What had been a scattered, weak protest movement was welded in the '90's into a powerful force that would work great change in the American social and political structure.

Just as the national movements of reform assumed larger proportions as the 20th century drew nearer, so did the social gospel. The late '80's and the '90's were the periods of institutional growth in the social gospel. They were also the years that saw the multiplication of the literature and the maturing of political and economic ideas. At the same time the social gospel minorities began to make their influence felt in the major Protestant denominations.²⁷

Further assurance was given to the social gospel leaders by the development of a new school of economics. The main stream of economic thought in American universities up to this time had been the tradition of classical economy with certain modifications by the nationalist, tariff-protection school of Mathew and Henry Carey. The social gospel spokesmen could not turn to this school for scholarly authority to back up their introduction of moral and ethical principles into economic relations. But in the 1880's a group of younger teachers turned their backs on orthodox economics to draw a more realistic picture of the economic struggle in America.

In 1885 the leaders of this movement, Richard T. Ely, Simon Patten, Edwin R. A. Seligman, Edmund J. James, and John Bates

Clark, organized the American Economics Association. It is noteworthy that a prominent social gospel leader, Washington Gladden, acted with them, and even served on the committee that drew up the first statement of principles. These principles included recognition of the state as a positive agent in human progress, a demand for historical and statistical study of actual economic conditions, the united effort of church, state, and science in tackling the problem of labor and capital, and a legislative program corresponding to developments in the national economy.²⁸ Such ideas were excellent material for the socially-minded clergymen.

It is against this background that the ideas of social Christianity on monopoly and wealth should now be considered. No longer were they merely a number of isolated preachers with advanced ideas, but a self-conscious vanguard with positive views; a minority, still, but one with more cohesion and with institutional cement through such groups as the Christian Social Union, the Church Association for the Improvement of Labor, the Evangelical Alliance for the United States of America, and the Brotherhood of the Kingdom.

In the 1890's the West produced a nationally known social gospel preacher, George D. Herron. Though he later adopted ideas too radical to be considered typical of the social gospel movement, and throughout was rather a stormy petrel, in his early career he can be considered a colorful representative of the movement. From his Chair of Applied Christianity at Iowa College (now called Grinnell) and through his speaking tours throughout the Middle West, Herron attracted wide attention to his version of the social gospel.

No prophet of the Old Testament ever excoriated his people for the worship of false gods in more extreme language than that of Herron. It was Herron's chief contribution to portray in flaming words the evils of a competitive commercial society. He identified self-interest and competition as the key principles of his time, and flailed the civilization of "remorseless engineering," "greed," "brute cunning," as "atheistic," and "nihilistic because it thrives on destruction."²⁹

Nor did Herron flinch from placing the responsibility of the social and economic problems of America directly on the activities of the monopolists. Writing in 1894, he maintained that the depression of 1893 was not due to any ordinary causes such as the tariff or money situation. Only incidentally were these involved: "It is the direct result of the centralization of wealth, of the control of industry, in the hands of the cunning and strong, who indirectly rule the lives and economies of the people, with no responsibility for their welfare, with entire unaccountability to their will."³⁰

When Herron shifted from criticism to exposition of his "law of sacrifice" and his goal of "social unity," his characteristic fervor

tended to becloud his logic. As always, his words had the ring of passionate conviction, but his meaning was too frequently obscured by the emotional overtones of his declamations. At times he appeared to be aiming his lessons at the individual alone, but, at other times, it appeared that it was the social system which needed correction first.

In one context he argued that it was impossible to hope for a "righteous State" before the people were righteous. Men of wealth must sacrifice their self-interest to the cause of Jesus, and "make the market as sacred as the church."³¹ All men were called by Herron to the message of the cross, to fulfill in themselves the great redemption offered by Christ. In this mood, it sounded as though he were telling his listeners that the only salvation of society lay in their conversion to the religion of Christ. But when Herron gave his attention to the existing social forms, it was apparent that he was steadily advancing along a line that would carry him out of the social gospel movement and into the Socialist party. Even in his early years of preaching Herron went further than any of his social gospel brethren in denouncing the competitive system. Where Gladden, Newton, Strong, and others maintained the essence of a competitive, free-enterprise idea within their critique, Herron held that the competitive spirit had done more harm than good, that it was destructive, and that the fittest did not survive.³²

For the political system, as it then operated, Herron had little or no sympathy. His scathing indictment was summed up in his book on *The Christian State*:

We Americans are not a democratic people . . . Our political parties are controlled by private, close political corporations that exist as parasites upon the body politic, giving us the most corrupting and humiliating despotism in political history . . . Our legislation is determined by a vast system of lobby . . . It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the chief work of both State and National legislatures in recent years has been to obstruct, defeat, or cheat the will of the people . . . Our American Senate, with members openly and shamelessly elected as virtual agents of vicious corporate properties, has been seriously reminding us of the court of Louis XIV. The moral tone of our politics has become so low, and the power of immoral wealth so subtle and strong that we have already ceased to think of our institutions as having any relation to political morality.³³

It should be emphasized that language of such an extreme nature was not characteristic of the majority of social gospel leaders. By the time the above was written, for example, *The Christian Union* had rescinded its "heartly approval" of Herron and questioned his extremism.³⁴ Also, the Evangelical Alliance had forced its general secretary, Josiah Strong, to resign from the editorial board of the *Kingdom*, a journal closely identified with Herron and his views. Such incidents illustrate the fact that while Herron was for a few years, 1890-94, a

widely publicized figure among progressive clerics, he soon moved away from the typical social gospel reform program.

Meantime, Washington Gladden, having moved to Columbus, Ohio, was working out his reasoned exposition of social Christianity, and, in particular, his idea of a reform program for the evils produced by the increasing concentration of wealth. In the mid-nineties, in articles and books, he presented this program to his public. It was a program which reflected his interest in the study of economics and his close association with the progressive founders of the American Economics Association.

Gladden admitted the possible use of the economic man as an abstraction. It might be of aid in the science of economics, but he felt that the assumption that each man acting in his own self-interest would produce the best possible social order was untrue and dangerous. He wrote as follows:

The theory that free-contract and cash payment furnish a sufficient basis for industrial society has been tried, and found wanting. The notion that the relations between masters and men should be regulated solely by supply and demand—that thus the master will get the most labor, and the men the most wages, and the community the greatest benefit, is a very pernicious notion.³⁵

Gladden was stating his basic proposition; that there was no field of endeavor where the rules of Christianity were not applicable, and that economic relations were as much relations between brothers as those of the family circle. Further, it seemed to him that in the field of commerce and industry the Christian law of brotherhood was not being obeyed. The supremacy of self-interest over benevolence and the attempt to place the laws of economics outside of any moral order were regarded by Gladden as the prevailing evils of the particular capitalistic doctrines that were then assumed to be immutable laws of economics.

The necessity for private ownership of property when circumscribed by moral and social obligations was insisted on by Gladden as the only basis for the production of the "highest type of manhood and womanhood." Property, he argued, "is, indeed, the raw material for the development of character . . . It is in the realm of property rights and obligations that my personality is largely shaped."³⁶ He held that until a person owns property which he can develop and use for the benefit of his fellow men, he cannot become truly "socialized." This lesson cannot be learned with property held in common. The property must belong to the individual so that he is free to express his own will in dealing with it. He rejected the absolute and indefeasible right to property which stripped the owner of too many of his responsibilities to society, and, likewise, the other extreme which deprived the individual of any right of ownership in favor of communal property.

Gladden's concept of the "socialized individual" could be attained only through the ownership of property, with an awareness of the social responsibilities attached thereto.

This ideal, Gladden felt, was threatened by the undue accumulation of wealth by certain corporations; that is, by monopolies and combinations in any form. Industrial freedom and individual initiative could not exist in the face of such aggregations of wealth and power. Furthermore, they were the most potent cause of the growth of corruption in the municipal, state, and national governments. By tampering with the courts of justice, by bribery of city councils, state legislatures, and even of Congress, they have "introduced into the body politic a virulent and deadly poison that threatens the very life of the Nation."⁸⁷

The theory that the corporation was a legal person got short shrift from Gladden. The corporations may be legally personified entities, but they must "find out whether they have souls or not." If they do have souls, and demonstrate this fact by conscientious administration, Gladden would not interfere. However, he pointed out, few have shown such an inclination. If they adopt the "soulless and conscienceless" character, the nation, itself a "moral organism," cannot entrust such great power to amoral agents. The nation, if such be the case, must take the corporation "firmly in hand and establish a rigid supervision of all its affairs."⁸⁸

Special attention was given by Gladden to a type of corporation which he defined as quasi-public. These were the corporations which stood between a purely public corporation, such as a municipality, and a purely private manufacturing company in which private gain was the sole interest. Included here were the railroads, telegraph system, light and power companies, street railways, and other public service type businesses. For particular attention, he selected the railroads, which were at that time the object of so much attention from the critics of capitalism. The whole dismal history of the financing of the railroads, the watering of stock, the frauds, the rebate system, had been aired by this time, and the Interstate Commerce Act passed in an attempt to restrain the worst abuses.

Gladden noted that the railroad franchises implied that private interests would be combined with public service, and if this was ignored by the railroad company, legislative action must be taken. It would be futile, thought Gladden, to argue that control has passed entirely from the hands of the people. The railroad derived its existence from the legislature; surely the creator can control the creature. The legislatures, continued Gladden, whose power is all derived from the people, cannot confer power to obstruct the industrial freedom of the people; "it is absurd to say that a legislative body in a democracy can endow a cor-

poration with powers by which it may subvert the very foundations of democratic government."³⁹ The endowment of the railroads with public domain, the use of the power of eminent domain to give the railroads a right of way, all definitely presuppose a public service. The state has, then, a clear duty to regulate and control when the public interest has been sacrificed. And, said Gladden, this has plainly been the case. Evils have arisen, largely because of the futile attempt to operate a business, which is inevitably and properly a monopoly, by the law of competition. The railroad, Gladden affirmed, "is essentially a monopoly; and the attempt to force it under a law of competition must result in economic wreck and moral ruin. It is a monopoly, and a monopoly which the government must either own or firmly control."⁴⁰

The question might well be asked: Where was control and regulation to end? Gladden had firmly rejected the solution of the confiscation of all property and its redistribution equally to all citizens. He was not a literal-minded equalitarian. He thought that as humans were unequal in ability, so the rewards must be proportionate. The alleged benefits of redistribution would be instead a "curse to those who have not won it by their own industry and frugality."⁴⁴ On the other hand, the state was constantly increasing the amount of control it exercised in the economy, and Gladden was recommending a further expansion. Where would the line be drawn between the regulated and non-regulated activities? Gladden's answer was that the nature of the various economic activities would in themselves provide the line of demarcation. Those industries and businesses that tend naturally to monopoly will be regulated in the public interest, but there will still remain a wide field of activities which will not permit of this type of organization. Gladden discarded logic; "if Nature," he wrote, "wants a certain result, she generally gets it."⁴²

In the late 1890's, George C. Lorimer, whose criticisms of the railroad grants have been noted above, returned to the attack on the "trusts." Lorimer, like Gladden, was concerned with the preservation of "individualism," and it was not the encroachments of government that posed the chief threat; rather the "feudal power and feudal arrogance of gigantic trusts." His strictures on the industrial organization were vivid enough to be worth quotation:

With the invention of various mechanical contrivances and with the changed conditions of existence, there has been a growing tendency to organize business and industry as armies are organized, with a few chief captains elaborately and profusely enriched and decorated, and with the great mass of people in strict subjection, earning only a pittance a day, who, if they remonstrate against hardships and injustice, are abruptly dismissed from the ranks to starve. These privates not only have no voice in the general management of affairs, but they even allude to their own personal difficulties and sense of outrage at the peril of their subsistence; and they are rendered more helpless by being acquainted with

only one part of the occupation they pursue . . . The current management of industrial works, with of course some exceptions, is of such a character as to rob men of their independence. It is too imperious, dictatorial, and absolute, and pushes autocracy too far.⁴³

Perhaps the most instructive example of the growth of anti-trust sentiment during the 1890's in the moderate reform circles of the social gospel can be found by reference again to the journal edited by Lyman Abbott, *The Christian Union*. Because it was a weekly magazine devoted to the ideal of presenting the news from a Christian point of view, this journal affords the reader a survey of social gospel opinions on the specific events of the political scene.

In the early '90's this paper carried news and editorial comments on such famous trust cases as Standard Oil, Bell Telephone, the merger of coal-carrying railroads in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, the Sugar Trust, and others. In all cases the opinions expressed were hostile to the corporations involved. So much so, indeed, that in 1892 the *New York Evening Post* saw fit to accuse *The Christian Union* of teaching anarchy.⁴⁴ Though such a charge was far from the truth, the *Union* had adopted a forthright anti-monopoly stand.

On the issue of railroad management it suggested an experiment in government operation:

For ourselves, we should like to see the Government take one of these railroads, as any other bondholder might do, and operate it, and so give the nationalization of the railroads a trial. Experiment is worth more than theory.⁴⁵

In the case of the Sugar Trust, *The Outlook* (new name of *The Christian Union*) vigorously dissented from the majority opinion of the Supreme Court, which declared the provisions of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act not applicable to the sugar industry. The editorial supported the dissenting opinion of Justice John M. Harlan; that the Sugar Trust was a combination in restraint of trade, and that the national government alone was sufficiently powerful to cope with such an organization. *The Outlook* expressed its opinion that giant organizations, injurious to the national economy, could not be properly supervised by the states, but only by the action of the federal arm.⁴⁶

Three editorials, in 1898, 1899, and 1900, of *The Outlook* were comprehensive enough to allow a good general picture to be drawn of the attitude of this journal on the problem of the concentration of wealth and the growth of monopoly. In the first, the editor described as dangerous to America the trend which saw the rich gradually acquiring a greater percentage of the national wealth. This trend must be checked, and the means suggested was a more effective tax program, including taxes on income, gifts, and inheritance.⁴⁷

In the second of these editorials, appearing in May, 1899, the editor took from Washington Gladden the argument that the primary

evil inherent in trusts was not necessarily combination, but overcapitalization. This argument recognized the increasing complexity of the social and economic organization, and held that a certain amount of combination was inevitable. In view of the difficulties of a purely competitive system, which in certain areas seemed to make for inefficiency in operation by requiring overlapping productive and distributive units and fostering the temptations of wage-cutting, price wars, adulteration of products, and other sharp practices, such an analysis had much to recommend it. This analysis assumed what was later to be proved true; that the attempt to prevent all combinations of any kind would be in vain.

The evil, claimed the editor, was in overcapitalization, which placed an abnormally high value on property, this value being sold in stocks and bonds. Thus, when the corporation attempted to pay interest and dividends on this extravagant value, the directors were forced to take the "unearned interest" out of either wages or prices. This practice, wrote the editor, was taking property without returning an equivalent, or "robbery without violence." The remedy suggested was legislation to prevent stock-watering, and an efficient corporation tax program.⁴⁸

These issues and other reforms were expounded in an editorial on the eve of the 1900 presidential election. The editor first indicated his concern with the trust movement. The control of fuel, light, sugar, transportation and other necessities by small groups cannot be regarded with other than "disfavor, if not apprehension." Nor could he see that either major party at this time showed a reasonable possibility of checking this movement. *The Outlook* disliked what it felt was Bryan's emotional appeal to the poor, but, on the other hand, the Republican party gave no promise of checking the growth of the "manufacturing aristocracy."⁴⁹

In lieu of the programs of the major parties, *The Outlook* offered to the public the following plan, which it felt would maintain the reality of "free competition," with opportunities for all:

1. Abolition of all special taxation, including protective tariffs, and the substitution therefor of a tariff levied for revenue only;
2. taxing corporate property values at no less a rate than private property;
3. prohibiting all false valuations or so-called watering, as a fraud upon the public;
4. requiring all corporations and all combinations of corporations to publish their accounts, and to subject them when required to official inquiry and investigation;
5. making a penal offense of all combinations to raise prices or limit production;
6. prohibiting one corporation control of another corporation for the purpose of establishing a monopoly;
7. prohibiting a monopoly from participation in inter-state commerce;

8. requiring all corporations dealing in the necessities of life to deal equally with all customers;
9. prohibiting public gambling whether in the products of industry or in the stocks of a company engaged in producing them;
10. bringing all corporations or combinations of corporations having to do with such necessities of modern life as coal, light, and transportation, under governmental supervision and regulation.⁵⁰

Thus far had the social gospel views on wealth and monopoly advanced from the first tentative steps in the mid-70's. A theoretical basis for their objections to the laissez-faire ideology had been provided, largely by Gladden, and a practical program of political measures recommended to implement their ideals. Property ownership was conceived of as indispensable to the full development of the individual; yet the prevailing system had enabled a few men to amass huge estates at the expense of the many. Therefore the primary good of a private property system had to be reconciled with the social welfare of the majority. The men of the social gospel rejected outright the socialist solution of expropriation of the means of production and distribution by the national government, for this contradicted their firm conviction that individual ownership was a positive good.

Their answer took the general form of a defense of "free competition" within certain limits. These limits have been stated above many times, but can be placed into two general categories: where combinations were economically efficient they must be permitted, but under close supervision of responsible public officials, and second, wherever it was possible for industry to be carried on in small units in a competitive framework, monopoly must be prohibited.

It is noteworthy how closely this program fitted into the progressive movement as it developed under Theodore Roosevelt's leadership, and it should be no surprise that of all the political figures of the early 20th century, Teddy Roosevelt was the favorite of such clerical progressives as Washington Gladden and Lyman Abbott. It would seem safe to assert that by 1900 one influential segment of Protestantism, firmly placed in the American liberal tradition, had developed a program for monopoly control, had preached and published it widely, contributing substantially to the preparation of the public for the "trust-busting" activities of national and political leaders such as Roosevelt and Wilson.

1. Allan Nevins, *The Emergence of Modern America*, Vol. VIII of *The History of American Life*, edited by A. M. Schlesinger and D. R. Fox (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927-1948), p. 397.
2. Henry F. May, *Protestant Churches and Industrial America* (New York: The Ronald Press, 1949), pp. 163, 170, 235.

3. R. Heber Newton, *The Morals of Trade* (New York: T. Whittaker, 1876), p. 30.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 33.

5. *Ibid.*

6. Washington Gladden, *Working People and their Employers* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company, 1888), pp. 80-88.

7. *Ibid.*, pp. 219-222.

8. Dudley Ward Rhodes, *Creed and Creed* (Cincinnati: P. G. Thomson, 1879), p. VI.
9. *Ibid.*
10. Henry C. Potter, *Sermons of the City* (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1881), pp. 81-91.
11. Frank Luther Mott, *Golden Multitudes* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1947), p. 8.
12. Josiah Strong, *Our Country, Its Possible Future and Its Present Crisis* (rev. ed.; New York: The Baker and Taylor Co., 1891), pp. 16-24.
13. *Ibid.*, p. 173.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 232.
15. Lyman Abbott, "Danger Ahead," *The Century Magazine*, XXXI (November, 1885), p. 55.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 55-56.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 55-58.
18. *Ibid.*
19. Ida Tarbell, *The Nationalizing of Business*, Vol. IX of *The History of American Life*, edited by A. M. Schlesinger and D. R. Fox (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1927-1948), p. 98.
20. George C. Lorimer, *Studies in Social Life* (Chicago: Belford, Clarke & Co., 1886), p. 47.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 48-49.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 235.
23. *The Christian Union*, XXXIII (Jan. 28, 1886), 1.
24. *Ibid.*, XXXIV (Nov. 4, 1886), 1.
25. T. Edwin Brown, *Studies in Modern Socialism and Labor Problems* (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1886), p. 34.
26. *Ibid.*, pp. 100-101.
27. For a discussion of the social gospel within the various denominations, see May, *op. cit.*, pp. 182-203; Charles H. Hopkins, *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism 1865-1915* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940), pp. 280-301.
28. Ralph H. Gabriel, *The Course of American Democratic Thought* (New York: The Ronald Press, 1940), pp. 298-299.
29. George D. Herron, *The Message of Jesus to Men of Wealth* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1891), pp. 10-11.
30. George D. Herron, *The Christian Society* (New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1894), p. 16.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 120.
32. George D. Herron, *The Christian State: A Political Vision of Christ* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co., 1895), p. 94.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 76-78.
34. *The Christian Union*, XLIX (May 12, 1894), 837.
35. Washington Gladden, *Applied Christianity, Moral Aspects of Social Questions* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1892), p. 47.
36. Washington Gladden, *Ruling Ideas of the Present Age* (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1895), p. 77.
37. Washington Gladden, *The New Idolatry and Other Discussions* (New York: McClure, Phillips and Co., 1905), p. 21.
38. Washington Gladden, *Social Facts and Forces* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1896), p. 114.
39. *Ibid.*, pp. 122-123.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 148.
41. Gladden, *Applied Christianity*, p. 17.
42. Washington Gladden, *Christianity and Socialism* (New York: Eaton and Maine, 1905), p. 128.
43. George C. Lorimer, *Christianity and the Social State* (Philadelphia: A. F. Rowland, 1898), pp. 152-153.
44. *The Christian Union*, XLV (May 7, 1892), 975.
45. *Ibid.*, XLIV (Dec. 19, 1891), 1205.
46. *The Outlook*, XXXI (Feb. 2, 1895), 182-183.
47. *Ibid.*, XLVIII (Dec. 30, 1898), 1222-1223.
48. *Ibid.*, LXII (May 13, 1899), 103.
49. *Ibid.*, LXVI (Oct. 20, 1900), 438.
50. *Ibid.*, LXVI (Oct. 20, 1900), 438-439.

SURVEY OF RECENT LITERATURE

BRITISH CHURCH HISTORY

Winthrop S. Hudson

The four hundredth anniversary of the Marian martyrs has been the occasion for giving renewed attention to that valiant company of men. Among the commemorative articles are Norman Sykes, "The Marian Martyrs," *Theology*, December, 1955; J. F. Mozley, "The Marian Martyrs," *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, July, 1955; and W. E. Booth Taylor, "Hugh Latimer," *Baptist Quarterly*, October, 1955. A volume by M. L. Loane, *Masters of the English Reformation* (1954) is a commemorative study which gives an account of the lives and martyrdoms of Bilney and Tyndale as well as of Latimer, Ridley, and Cranmer. Latimer has been the subject of two competent studies by sympathetic interpreters—H. S. Darby, *Hugh Latimer* (1953) and A. G. Chester, *Hugh Latimer: Apostle to the English* (1954). G. W. Bromiley, *Thomas Cranmer, Theologian* (1956) concludes that Cranmer's chief significance was not as an original and creative mind but as an alert and able scholar who was able to formulate for the Church of England "a balanced synopsis of its Reformation convictions."

Philip Hughes' notable study based on a fresh examination of the sources, *The Reformation in England*, has now been completed with the publication of Volume III, *True Religion Now Established* (1954). Written by a Roman Catholic scholar, it contains several new penetrating insights. P. M. Dawley, *John Whitgift and the English Reformation* (1954) is a discerning account of the Elizabethan Church from the perspective of one of its key architects. A balanced appraisal of the English Reformation and its continuing influence is given by Norman Sykes, "The Legacy of the Reformation," *Modern Churchman*, March,

1956. H. F. Woodhouse, *The Doctrine of the Church in Anglican Theology, 1547-1603* (1954) is a useful compendium of the opinions of the leading figures of the period.

Two notable books have been published which seek to identify the dynamic of the Puritan movement. Alan Simpson, *Puritanism in Old and New England* (1955) depicts Puritanism as essentially a religious revival, with its primary stress upon the necessity for individual conversion through the miracle of grace. William Haller, *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution* (1955) is a complementary study which finds in the Puritan insistence upon freedom to preach the Word the major factor fostering the development of democratic structures which few Puritans anticipated and many deplored. Roland M. Frye, "The Teachings of Classical Puritanism on Conjugal Love," *Studies in the Renaissance* (1955) provides an illustration of how consultation of the sources will dispel a widely held cliché, for he finds that the Puritans regarded physical love in marriage "as good and pure in itself, no matter how ardent it might be." J. F. Maclear, "The Heart of New England Rent: The Mystical Element in Early in Early Puritan History," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, March, 1956, is an illuminating study, and A. W. Argyle, "The Cambridge Platonists," *Hibbert Journal*, April, 1955, points out that no group has been "more widely neglected" than the Emmanuel College Independents who became known as the "Cambridge Platonists." One of the more "popular" Puritan mystics has been treated by Leo F. Solt, "William Dell: New Model Army Chaplain," *Church Quarterly Review*, January-March, 1954. Another New Model Army Chaplain, who was not

a mystic, has received the serious attention he deserves from Raymond P. Stearns, *The Strenuous Puritan: Hugh Peter, 1598-1660* (1954). Roger Sharrock, *John Bunyan* (1954) is a wise, informative, and sympathetic study, and G. O. Griffith, "Bunyan's Pilgrim: A Dutch Forerunner," *Hilbert Journal*, October, 1954, calls attention to a Dutch book, published in an English translation nineteen years before the appearance of *Pilgrim's Progress* "which may well have carried the seedling idea of the Pilgrim allegory" and which is "well worthy of notice for its own sake."

Thomas Fuller, whose charming style and gentle humor has endeared him to many readers, was greatly admired by John Wesley, a fact which has led W. L. Doughty, "Thomas Fuller and the Wesleys," *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, January, 1955, to compare Fuller's generous and catholic spirit with that of the Wesleys. In an article of similar character, Erick Routley, "Charles Wesley and Matthew Henry," *Congregational Quarterly*, October, 1955, demonstrates beyond all question that Charles Wesley often found the primary inspiration for his hymns in Matthew Henry's *Commentaries*. C. J. Wright, "Methodism and the Church of England," *Modern Churchman*, December, 1955, is less convincing in his contention that Wesley believed that "a national church is not a denomination and should embrace all who are willing to be embraced. That is why Wesley held that his followers were members of the Church of England provided they did not positively dissent from its ministry of word and sacrament." Frank Baker, "The Beginnings of the Methodist Covenant Service," *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, July, 1955, places "For Such as would Enter into or Renew their Covenant with God" among John Wesley's more important liturgical contributions. Insight into the period immediately preceding the Wesleyan revival is provided by H. P. Thompson, *Thomas Bray* (1954).

This study deals with the founder of the S.P.C.K. and S.P.G. in terms of the formative influence exerted by his experiences in his two English parishes prior to his appointment as Commissary for Maryland. A brief study of some significance in the same connection is K. J. R. Robson, "The S.P.C.K. in Action: Some Episodes from the East Riding of Yorkshire," *Church Quarterly Review*, July-September, 1955, which describes the activity of the S.P.C.K. in establishing schools for the education of poor children during the first three decades of the eighteenth century.

After long neglect, the nineteenth century is beginning to receive serious attention from historical scholars. Of particular interest is the radical shift in the climate of theological opinion as a result of the successive impacts of the new scientific, Biblical, and psychological studies. H. G. Wood, *Belief and Unbelief Since 1850* (1955) deals with this subject with charm and insight, while L. E. Elliott-Binns, *English Thought, 1860-1900: The Theological Aspect* (1956) covers the same ground in more detail. Willis B. Glover, Jr., *Evangelical Nonconformists and Higher Criticism in the Nineteenth Century* (1954) has a more restricted focus and handles his material with real competence. He suggests that the crisis for Nonconformity came in 1887 when Spurgeon initiated the "down-grade" controversy. John W. Grant, *Free Churchmanship in England, 1870-1940* (1955) is one of the more important books to be published in recent years. He describes in detail the disintegration of Free Church life as a result of a rising tide of individualism fostered both by Evangelicalism and by theological liberalism. One of the decisive events of the theological world of the nineteenth century was the publication of *Essays and Reviews* in 1860. Brief evaluations of the contributions of three of the contributors are to be found in the June and December, 1955 issues of the *Modern Churchman*: F. S. W. Simpson, "Frederick Temple's

Contribution to English Modernism"; D. L. Scott, "Rowland Williams, 1817-1870"; and E. D. Mackerness, "Benjamin Jowett: Preacher and Prophet." Norton Garfinkle, "Science and Religion in England, 1790-1800," *Journal of the History of Ideas*, June, 1955, sets the stage for the nineteenth century period of controversy.

R. F. Wearmouth, *Methodism and the Struggle of the Working Classes* (1954) displays the same careful research which characterized his earlier volumes and shows that, while the Primitive Methodists were almost without exception Liberal or Labor in their sympathies, the Wesleyans were mostly Tories. Mary Morris, *Voluntary Organizations and Social Progress* (1955) deals with the nineteenth century philanthropic enterprises and the activities of the churches as well as with political movements and trade unions. Peter F. Anson, *The Call of the Cloister: Religious Communities and Kindred Bodies in the Anglican Communion* (1955) tells the story of the new orders that have developed within the Church of England during the past century.

Because of the present plight of the British churches, the subject of evangelism is becoming of increasing concern to British churchmen. F. W. Dillistone, "Britain and the Second Industrial Revolution," *Theology Today*, April, 1956, points out that "historically the great growth of the Free Churches in Great Britain was closely associated with the first Industrial Revolution," but "it is questionable whether the ethos and tradition, either of the Established Church or of the Free, are capable in their present forms of dealing with the new situation which the second Industrial Revolution has brought into being." J. Ernest Rattenbury, *Evangelism and Pagan England* (1954) analyzes the evangelism of the decades which preceded the First World War and relates it to the problems posed by a shifting psychological climate and the more recent stress upon corporate salvation. *Evangelism in Scotland*, published by the

Iona Community Publications Department, and John Wren-Lewis, "The Evangelistic Situation in England Today," *Hibbert Journal*, October, 1954, as well as the several articles in the *Hibbert Journal*, October, 1955, and the *London Quarterly and Holborn Review*, April, 1955, contain valuable information. The story of the Billy Graham campaigns in England and Scotland is told by Frank Colquhoun, *Harringay Story* (1954) and by Tom Allan, ed., *Crusade in Scotland* (1955). The "Moral Rearmament" movement which has found considerable support in Great Britain has been the subject of two studies. Geoffrey Williamson, *Inside Buchmanism: An Independent Inquiry into the Oxford Group Movement and Moral Rearmament* (1955) is an account by a British journalist who participated for a time in the movement. A more serious study is contained in the *Report on Moral Rearmament*, prepared by the Church of England's Social and Industrial Council. The theological section of the report has been called by Reinhold Niebuhr "the most authentic and searching description and criticism of the movement which has been produced since its inception." J. C. Wansey, "Missionary Methods in an English Parish," *Theology*, August, 1954 (reprinted with additions by the author, Woodford Rectory, London E. 18) describes another approach to the contemporary situation which involved an acknowledgment that Christian faith can no longer be taken for granted and which provoked vigorous replies from the defenders of the idea of a national church. An account of some of the "missionary methods" advocated by Wansey is contained in Norman Goodall, *A History of the London Missionary Society, 1895-1945* (1954), a volume distinguished by the literary skill, historical judgment, and theological insight of the author. Shifts in missionary policy, growth of cooperation, and the emergence of the younger churches as "self-governing, self-supporting, and self-propagating" bodies are the major themes.

The issue of ministerial order has been a major problem for Anglicans in ecumenical discussions, and in an exceedingly important study, which was first prepared for the Gunning Lectures in Edinburgh, Norman Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyterian: The Anglican Attitude to Episcopacy, Presbyterianism and Papacy since the Reformation* (1956) has let the record itself pronounce the verdict as to the historic position of the Church of England on this issue. Needless to say, the record is full of surprises. Since Professor Sykes' discussion of ministerial order centered attention upon the problem as it related to the Church of Scotland, it provoked a parallel interest in the northern kingdom. Among the more important articles are D. C. Lusk, "Scotland and England: Our Next Task in Church Union," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, March, 1955; Stewart Mechie, "Episcopacy in Post-Reformation Scotland," *ibid.*; G. S. M. Walker, "Scottish Ministerial Orders," *ibid.*, September, 1955; and Bernhard Citron, "The Reformed Ministry in the Contemporary Church," *ibid.*, December, 1955. Of somewhat parallel interest is Gordon Donaldson, *The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637* (1954), which presents a critical study of this famous Scottish Prayer Book and exposes the legends which partisan zeal fostered. A very perceptive and informative account of two Free Church

bodies is given by E. A. Payne, "Baptist and Congregationalist Relationships," *Congregational Quarterly*, July, 1955.

The practical aspect of the ministry is the subject of A. Tindal Hart, *The Eighteenth Century Country Parson* (1955) and A. Tindal Hart and Edward Carpenter, *The Nineteenth Century Country Parson* (1954). Theological education is discussed by F. W. B. Bullock, *A History of Training for the Ministry of the Church of England, 1800-1874* (1955), which provides many interesting glimpses of church life a century ago, and by Kenneth Wadsworth, *Yorkshire United Independent College* (1954), which gives real insight into the efforts of the Free Churches to provide adequate ministerial training. J. W. Ashley Smith, *The Birth of Modern Education: the Contribution of the Nonconformist Dissenting Academies, 1650-1800* (1955) is of broader scope but contains much information on ministerial education.

Canon Law and the Church of England, ed. Philip E. Hughes (1955) is a series of seven essays which assess the proposed revisions of the Canons of 1603-4. *A History of Christianity in Yorkshire*, ed. F. S. Popham (1954), a book designed as a supplement to the Agreed Syllabus for Religious Education in Yorkshire, contains much fascinating information.

SURVEY OF RECENT LITERATURE

EASTERN ORTHODOX LITERATURE

Matthew Spinka

Malachia Ormanian's well-known history of the Armenian Church in its English translation has recently been republished in a revised version.¹ It was published originally in French (1910) and a year later in Armenian. The English translation appeared in 1912; the present is the revised edition of the latter. But the revision, with the exception of the addition of chapter XX which deals with the twentieth century (to 1954) consists of occasional meagre footnotes which do not adequately explain the changes which have taken place since the original text was written, and this despite the editor's remark concerning an unrevised edition published in Boston that "It is of course quite valueless" (p.v.). Thus one reads in the text of the conditions which prevailed in Turkey of the sultans and Russia of the tsars and which have since been almost completely changed without an adequate treatment of those basic changes. Why has not the text itself been brought up to date?

The work itself cannot be regarded as of a critical nature. The author insists on declaring the Armenian Church an apostolic one, founded by St. Thaddeus and St. Bartholomew, although he admits that no genuine source materials confirming the tradition exist (n. 3). But he consoles himself with the reflection that the Roman Catholic Church's claims are no better. Nevertheless, despite the shaky basis for his claim, he positively asserts that "The apostolic origin of the Armenian Church is hence established as an incontrovertible fact in ecclesiastical history" (p. 4). He is, of course, on more secure ground beginning with the work of St. Gregory the Illuminator (301), to whom he ascribes the establishment of Christianity as state religion of Armenia.

Much space is devoted to the controversies regarding the two natures of Christ as dealt with by the Councils of Ephesus (431) and of Chalcedon (451). The author comes out squarely in support of the Cyrillian formula adopted at Ephesus, and unequivocally terms it "monophysite," although at the same time he resolutely repudiates the Eutychian version of it (pp. 96-7). The Chalcedonian formula is "rejected" on p. 94, but "not rejected" on p. 97. At any rate, the Armenian Church recognizes as valid and authoritative only the first three ecumenical Councils. The author advances in support of this limited dogmatic basis the curious argument that since dogmas constitute "a difficulty to the human understanding" (p. 92), it is obviously better to limit them as much as possible. Thus the recognition of only three Councils is an advantage as against the Greek seven or the Roman Catholic twenty.

Besides, there is a noticeable polemic tendency against Roman Catholicism, which may be explained by the fact that Patriarch Ormanian himself was born in that communion and joined the national Church only in 1879.

It is to be regretted that the work of revision is so meagre as to leave the reader with an inadequate understanding of the developments during the last forty-five years. Thus, for instance there is but a brief account of the situation of the Armenian Church under the Soviets, and even that is self-contradictory: thus in the same chapter the editor asserts that since 1922 the Church in the Soviet Union "has been experiencing a renaissance unique in its long and glorious history" (p. 77), while on p. 84 he tells us that "the most important problem which the preservation of its existence and the Church of Armenia faces today is

integrity. In Soviet Armenia the Church is weak because of the great lack of clergymen." There is not a word about the fact that the Catholicos Gevork V (1932-34) was put to death by the Russian secret police and that for the next six years no patriarchal election was permitted. Altogether, the original work is not critical; and its revision is quite inadequate to make it as useful as it might have been.

Since the religious situation in the Soviet Union has for many decades been deliberately and purposely misrepresented even by the spokesmen of the Russian Church itself, a work dealing with the subject is always welcome. Among the latest is the volume by Professor Curtiss entitled *The Russian Church and the Soviet State*.² This is the most detailed treatment of the subject among the recent books of this nature, and is based on a wealth of source materials, mostly Russian. The author deals exhaustively with the earlier period—the patriarchates of Tikhon and Sergei. But the period since 1945, the patriarchate of Alexei, is noticeably less exhaustive. One wonders why.

The task of the historian, even the most fast and painstaking, whose sources of information are from opportunistic or precautionary motives distorted to fit the official policy of the government, is admittedly exceedingly difficult. All such treatments must necessarily be tentative, subject to later revision pending more reliable and adequate information. Dr. Curtiss, however, has complicated his task even more by adopting the curious method of setting side-by-side with his information derived from the ecclesiastical sources also the governmental version of these events, apparently without making an adequate effort to verify or evaluate either of them. The result is naturally self-contradictory. It does not take very great acquaintance with the Soviet sources to discover the non-objective and propagandist nature of them and to learn not to lean very heavily on them. This the author has

failed to do. And although it would not be fair to characterize all his conclusions and judgments as leaning toward the official interpretation, a general tendency toward such conclusions is undeniable. It is this feature which limits the usefulness of Dr. Curtiss' work.

A small book dealing with the same subject but exhibiting the opposite tendency was recently published in Germany.³ The Russian author, otherwise unknown to me, writes under the pseudonym of Gleb Rar (although his real name is also given—A. Vetrov). The title of his work—*The Captive Church*—indicates the author's own judgment as to the position of the Russian Orthodox Church within the Soviet Union. And although his sources of information are somewhat limited in scope, yet they are essentially adequate to enable him to develop and document his thesis that the Russian Church has succumbed to the domination of the state since 1927, when Metropolitan Sergei, motivated by his desire to secure legal recognition for his administration, issued his "Declaration." Since then the subjugation of the Church has proceeded gradually but steadily. During the patriarchate of Alexei (since 1945) this relationship has assumed the proportions of "captivity," wherein the patriarch has entered (apparently voluntarily) into the "political arena" (p. 56). His activity "coincides" with the governmental plans. This the author regards as "the cost which the Church in the USSR is compelled to pay the communists for the grant of the freedom of cult" (p. 57). His activity takes the form of attempting to secure the hegemony of the Orthodox East (thus depriving the Patriarch of Constantinople of his traditional pre-eminence); of the restoration of his supremacy over the Russian churches abroad (including the American Russian Church); of the struggle against the Vatican and the West generally; and of the so-called "peace campaigns." Nevertheless, in contrast with the severe condemnation of Alexei express-

ed by the Russian hierarchs organized under the headship of Metropolitan Anastasy (with headquarters in New York), our author deprecates all such moral judgments, although not to the point of denying the factual truth of the use which the state makes of the Church at the present time.

Perhaps I may be allowed in this connection to remark that my own book, entitled *The Church in Soviet Russia*, is to be published this fall by the Oxford University Press.

One always rejoices at the publication of any of Berdyaev's works: this time it is the first English translation of his early work, *The Meaning of the Creative Act*.⁴ It was originally completed in 1914, and represents the period in his life when he arrived at his basic ideas and convictions, to the explication and elaboration of which he devoted the rest of his life. Naturally, these ideas were then expressed in a form which under the impact of the vastly changed world conditions needed a restatement. In the preface to the German translation which was published in 1927 Berdyaev, acknowledging that he had been "too optimistic," revised the original text. But as time went on, even this revision did not prove sufficiently radical; hence, he refused to authorize an English translation until he had time to revise it still further. Unfortunately, he never found opportunity to do so. Thus the present excellent translation of Donald A. Lowrie—the foremost authority on Berdyaev—is based on the original text, although it incorporates the revisions made in the German translation. The work is still basic to the complete understanding of Berdyaev's spiritual and intellectual development.

And finally I wish to call attention to a recent book which is devoted to the study and documentation of the legal aspects of the Church-state relationships in the communist-dominated countries. It comprises separate studies contributed by specialists in their respective fields under the gen-

eral editorship of Vladimir Gsovski.⁵ The countries included are Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Romania, with an introductory chapter on the Soviet Union. Only the two chapters dealing with the last-named countries belong properly to a review devoted to Eastern Orthodoxy; but since the pattern of church-state relationships in satellite countries is essentially the same, a general study of it gives a more complete view of any particular phase. But a special mention may be made of the Church of Romania, since it has not been mentioned hitherto. Romania, although overwhelmingly Orthodox, has deprived its national Church of all special privileges it had formerly enjoyed as such. The Constitution of 1952 no longer accords it a higher status than to any other. Roman Catholics were forcibly compelled to sever their ties with the Vatican, and the Uniate Church was absorbed by the Orthodox body. The book is particularly valuable for the translations of the basic legislation and other pertinent source materials.

For a more detailed and general treatment of the Romanian Church during the rule of the communist regime a satisfactory account is to be found in the work of Nikolai Pop, entitled *Kirche unter Hammer und Sichel*.⁶

1. Malachia Ormanian, *The Church of Armenia*, 2nd edition revised by Terenig Poladian (London, A. R. Mowbray & Co. Ltd., 1955) xxvi-219 pages.
2. John Shelton Curtiss, *The Russian Church and the Soviet State* (Boston, Little Brown and Co., 1953), x-387 pages.
3. Gleb Rar (A. Vetrov), *Plenennaya Tserkov* (Frankfort am Main, Possev-Verlag, 1954), 113 pages.
4. Nicolas Berdyaev, *The Meaning of the Creative Act*, tr. Donald A. Lowrie (New York, Harper & Bros., 1955), 344 pages.
5. Vladimir Gsovski, ed., *Church and State behind the Iron Curtain* (New York, Frederick Praeger, 1955), xxi-311 pages.
6. Nikolai Pop, *Kirche unter Hammer und Sichel* (Berlin, 1953).

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

"Moses Stuart: 1780-1852." By John H. Giltner (224 Connecticut Ave., West Haven, Conn.). Yale University, 1956. Director: Sydney Ahlstrom.

Moses Stuart, proclaimed by his contemporaries, as well as by later observers as "the father of Biblical Science in America," was born of humble farmer parents in Wilton, Connecticut in 1780. Trained first for the law and then for the ministry at Yale, where as a tutor he fell under the religious influence of Timothy Dwight and the New Divinity theology, he first gained distinction as the pastor of New Haven's historic First (Center) Church, to which he was called in 1806. A brilliant preacher and an energetic pastor, he led his people in a noteworthy religious revival during the four years of his pastorate.

In 1810 he left New Haven to become Professor of Sacred Literature at the recently founded Congregational seminary at Andover, Massachusetts. Inadequately prepared for this task, he taught himself Hebrew and German, the latter of which especially enabled him to keep abreast of the new advances in Biblical learning taking place abroad. Though his evangelical New Divinity background was never thrown off, by the end of the decade he had readily appropriated much of the best of contemporary Biblical scholarship.

By 1820 he was thoroughly at home in the grammatico-historical system of hermeneutics which in turn became the key to all of his later theological, exegetical and critical work. As a teacher he was creative and inspiring. Several of America's important nineteenth century Biblical scholars, including Edward Robinson, Josiah W. Gibbs and Calvin Stowe, were among his pupils. Others on the mission fields perpetuated his principles of

Biblical scholarship in a series of notable Bible translations.

A prolific writer, his best theological work was his Biblical defense of the doctrine of the Trinity against the rapidly rising American Unitarian position. Equally important, if not as popular, was his grammatico-historical reading of the first chapters of Genesis against the less literal interpretations of America's leading geologists. His most lasting achievements, however, were in the realm of philological and exegetical studies. His Hebrew and Greek grammars, though generally reworkings of European prototypes, were the earliest thorough works of their kind in this country. His exhaustive *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (1827-28) was a notable landmark in American Biblical science. This was followed by five other exegetical and critical studies of similar stature. Each in its own way was an invaluable mine of contemporary philological, critical and theological information.

In the midst of this work Stuart was vitally interested in the relevance of the Bible to contemporary social problems. Two of these, intemperance and slavery, were of particular concern, Stuart taking an absolutist position against the former, a moderate position on the latter.

He retired in 1848 after thirty-eight years of fruitful teaching. Alert and productive to the last, Stuart died in 1852, rich in the honor of his colleagues and world-known in his achievements.

"George Fox's Teaching on Redemption and Salvation." By T. Canby Jones (Wilmington College, Wilmington, Ohio). Yale University, 1956. Director: Roland H. Bainton.

The key to understanding the message and thought of George Fox is

found in his doctrine of redemption and salvation through Christ. In contrast to the views of some modern interpreters, Fox was not concerned with the inwardness of religious experience as such but with Christ's total work of redemption and salvation. Fox stressed the inward saving power of Christ in the heart but this grew out of a firm belief in Christ's historic life, death, and resurrection.

Following the Augustinian tradition Fox believed man and creation were originally perfect but that now all men live under the curse of their own and Adam's disobedience, free only to disobey God further. Fox further held that through redemption and regeneration in Christ man has been restored to the state of Adam before the fall, to a state of moral perfection. Regenerate man, so long as he is obedient to the light of Christ within, declared Fox, is not able to sin.

Fox stressed Christ's spirit dwelling in man and most frequently called it the light or the seed. Fox insisted that this indwelling light is divine and quite distinct from man's nature; it is Christ entering man to redeem him from sin.

George Fox rejected what he called common or natural grace for the Grace of Christ which is both universal and saving grace. Though sufficient in principle, this grace does not actually save most men because they rebel against it. Therefore, a special saving grace of the Incarnate Christ is required.

Suffusing all of Fox's soteriology was an exaltation of the transcendent lordship of Christ as universal King, co-ruler with the Father, sustaining all things by his word and power; as heavenly high Priest who died to save all men; as heavenly Prophet come to teach His people Himself.

"Protestant Missions in Communist China." By Creighton Lacy (The Divinity School, Duke University, Durham, N.C.). Yale University, 1953. Directors: Liston Pope and K. S. Latourette.

This is an attempt to summarize the actual experience of foreign missionaries and Christian institutions under the People's Republic of China. Five introductory chapters set the background of Communist policy toward the Church as revealed through theory and practice in Europe, Chinese Communist pronouncements, and the successive encounters in China from 1921 to 1948.

The core of the dissertation consists of 225 questionnaires submitted by 300 missionaries who served under the Communist regime. Although this covered only 15% of the entire group, it represented the cooperation of all but two major mission boards and over 40% returns from the Americans interrogated. These replies were supplemented by innumerable diaries, interviews, private letters, reports, and such personal narratives as had appeared in books and magazines by 1953, not to mention the "editor's" own 16 months in Red China and 20 years of previous China residence.

This material was sorted under six geographic regions, in an effort to find an overall pattern and general trends amid local variations. Careful dating and extensive quotations reveal the gradual developments in the treatment of missionary personnel and institutions, but no attempt was made to interpret the experience or attitude of the Chinese Christian Church, in the conviction that that story cannot be told this early or by an "outsider." Separate chapters are devoted to property, to public trials, and to imprisonment of foreign missionaries.

It was never intended to draw elaborate conclusions from this data, but the following statements seem to be supported by the empirical facts. Chinese Communist policy appears fully consistent with the dual approach of Marx-Leninism: that "religion is the opiate of the people," social subversion and unscientific superstition, but that a frontal assault is less effective than propaganda pressures. In China particularly anti-religion is inextricably linked with anti-imperial-

ism. The treatment of missions was therefore based on the exercise of totalitarian control over education, medicine, social welfare, etc. The treatment of missionaries was based on charges of espionage, subversion, graft, and other political crimes, not on religious activity. No changes in mission policy or Christian program, however laudable, would have made any substantial difference in the government's attitude toward foreigners and their work.

The Korean War indubitably hastened the pressures against foreign missionaries, but their gradual elimination had been outlined by Premier Chou En-lai six weeks before. The overwhelming majority polled felt amply warranted in remaining to help the Chinese Church as long as possible, despite restrictions and growing threats. Those singled out for public accusation and often detention were almost invariably those missionaries with greatest influence or prestige in the local community. What ever limited freedom may be granted to Chinese Christians, totalitarian Communism cannot tolerate the rival loyalties represented by foreign ambassadors of Jesus Christ.

"Methodist Theology in America in the Nineteenth Century." By Leland H. Scott. Yale University, 1955. Directors: Julian Hartt and Claude Welch.

American Methodism's *theological* history has been a neglected field of study. Especially is this true of the mid-nineteenth century period (ca. 1825-85). During these years, a significantly integrated body of theological literature was prepared by American Methodism's editors (Bangs, McClintock, Whedon, Curry), college presidents (Fisk, Olin, Warren), and seminary professors (Raymond, Summers, Foster, Tigert, Wiley). Although the basic motifs of the Wesleyan theology were sustained in the experience and writings of these men, the content of their theology increas-

ingly reflected issues and demands indigenous to the American context.

Methodism's theological literature (both polemical and systematic) assumed a discernible place in the contemporary American doctrinal discussions, endeavoring somewhat successfully to maintain a median position between the contextual extremes of religious liberalism and theological scholasticism. American Methodism was especially critical of those religious philosophies which sought emancipation from traditional Protestant orthodoxy. The Methodist polemic proceeded out of a concern to sustain a doctrinal position adequate both to the tradition of Christian soteriology and to the practical realities of evangelical experience. (Such a concern was not immediately affected by the declining emphasis on the empirical associations of Christian conversion—a transition which did affect inherited Wesleyan emphases on Christian experience.)

Methodism's most significant contribution to the American discussions was by way of its stress on the *gracious* foundations of man's present moral freedom (the doctrine of "gracious ability"). Actually, much of the character of Methodist theology in the mid-century period may be defined as an effort to present a systematic dialectic over against the revisionist claims of American Calvinism (especially where the doctrine of moral agency was involved). It was partly under the pressure of such a concern—and partly under the influence of "Common-Sense" philosophical criteria—that Methodism's theologians were led into a critique of certain "ambiguities" in the soteriology and theological anthropology inherited from the Wesleys. The ultimate effect of such critical tendencies (seen especially in D. D. Whedon and J. Miley) was a major re-orientation of Methodist theology in terms of a highly nominalistic doctrine of moral responsibility (limited in terms of intrinsically free, personal agency). Although the outlines of Wesleyan the-

ology were never wholly replaced, redemptive grace was no longer the supremely unitive element in Methodism's doctrine of man.

Although prevailingly conservative, American Methodism's theologians were not unaware of the major developments in critical and scientific (evolutionary) thought which so characterized the latter portion of the nineteenth century. Some (such as W. F. Warren) insisted that Methodism must achieve intellectual relevancy during such a transitional period. Others (such as T. O. Summers) were more concerned to sustain the fundamentals of evangelical orthodoxy. And while most American Methodists shared something of both concerns, conservative elements approached the tension between the adaptive and something of a crisis during the last years of the nineteenth century—a period which saw the emergence of new methodologies and new leadership (Bowne, Terry, Tillett, Curtis, and Sheldon) in the field of systematic theology.

Such an historical view of the characteristics of Wesleyan-Methodist theology, in addition to providing the necessary background for analyzing subsequent developments, enables us better to discern the unitive elements, and contemporary relevance of that theology.

"Anabaptist Revolution Through the Covenant in Sixteenth Century Continental Protestantism." By Lowell H. Zuck (Eden Theological Seminary, Webster Groves 19, Missouri). Yale University, 1955. Directors: Roland H. Bainton and H. Richard Niebuhr.

The religious revolutionaries par excellence of the sixteenth century continental Reformation were the radical Anabaptist covenanters, like Thomas Müntzer, who believed that allegiance to their covenant would inaugurate the eschatological Kingdom of God on earth. This dissertation pre-

sents an historical sketch of the Anabaptist revolutionaries and an analysis of their covenant theology. Anabaptism is defined as fanatical religious idealism centered in the hope for a completely new Church, state, and society. Though the new order will be ushered in by God, the elect believer is sworn into a revolutionary covenant, in proof of his serious commitment to the cause.

The Anabaptist program for enlistment into the revolutionary covenant required a preliminary subjective test for the presence of both election and conversion, as the individual believer covenanted inwardly with Christ and submitted to baptism, which was the outward sign of the covenant.

In regard to the social covenant, the Anabaptists developed a view of association midway between that of medieval "Genossenschaftsrecht" and post-Reformation natural law individualism and federalism. Frequently, the violent Anabaptists anticipated a more expansive social role for themselves than their withdrawn non-resistant associates.

The Anabaptist view of the church covenant enforced vigorous internal discipline, in imitation of Christ, including believer's baptism, the Lord's Supper, a ban against association with unbelievers, non-resistance, non-swearing, cross-bearing in martyrdom, and a vocation for each member in carrying out the Great Commission.

The controlling revolutionary hope of radical Anabaptism was that human society and the continuing Catholic and Protestant forms of the "Volkskirche" would be destroyed within the near future, when the cataclysmic world-end and the return of Christ would vindicate the covenanted saints and annihilate the godless. They felt, in addition, that immediate measures should be taken by the saints to insure destruction of the godless, through either non-resistance or violence, which, they believed, would accelerate the coming of the Kingdom.

The Peasants' War and response

from cities such as Münster in Westphalia provided them with revolutionary opportunities, but their heretical re-baptist church doctrines and occasional antinomian tendencies toward communism and polygamy provoked ruthless suppression by leaders of church and state. In defense against the radical covenant doctrines of the Anabaptists, Huldreich Zwingli, the leader of the Swiss Reformation, introduced a further development of covenant theology which matured

within seventeenth century Dutch, English, and American Puritanism.

After the exhaustion of their early revolutionary hopes, the Anabaptists either withdrew into segregated conventicles or accommodated to rural or urban norms of respectability. Their significant influence upon the Church and society came during the first two decades of the Reformation, when they combined revolutionary eschatology with resolute denunciation of the Church and the world around them.

NEW LEVELS OF HISTORICAL CONCERN AMONG THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST

W. B. BLAKEMORE, *Disciples Divinity House*

KIETH, NOEL L. *The Story of D. S. Burnet: Undeserved Obscurity*. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1954. 272 pp. \$3.00.

LUNGER, HAROLD L. *The Political Ethics of Alexander Campbell*. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1954. 304 pp. \$3.00.

MCALLISTER, LESTER G. *Thomas Campbell: Man of the Book*. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1954. 294 pp. \$3.00.

MOSELEY, J. EDWARD. *Disciples of Christ in Georgia*. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1954. 400 pp. \$3.00.

WALKER, GRANVILLE. *Preaching in the Thought of Alexander Campbell*. St. Louis: The Bethany Press, 1954. 271 pp. \$3.00.

WEST, WILLIAM GARRETT. *Barton Warren Stone: Early American Advocate of Christian Unity*. Nashville: The Disciples of Christ Historical Society, 1954. xvi plus 245 pp. \$4.00.

The autumn of 1954 turned out to be the most exciting single season that historians of the Disciples of Christ have ever experienced. Two events of far-reaching importance came to fruition, one in October, 1954, and another at the year's end. The October event was a public announcement by the Christian Board of Publication of a new venture to be known as the Bethany History Series. The December event (announced early in 1955) was a gift to the Disciples of Christ Historical Society which assured it a building of its own. These events mark a new era with respect to historical enterprise among the Disciples of Christ.

The Disciples of Christ have often, and rightly, been considered a people of meager historical consciousness. Two causes in particular have played their role in this regard. The communion is still less than one hundred and fifty years old. At the turn of the

century there were hundreds alive who had known the founders of the movement personally. It was not until well into the 1920s that there began to be any wide-spread recognition of the need of preserving the past. It is typical of religious movements—and of other social movements—that only with the third generation does a sense of the need of written history arise.

But another factor had played a stronger role in delaying the birth of an historical consciousness amongst the Disciples. Their movement was originally "restorationist." Restorationism typically belittles all history since the appearance of the original model, even the history of the restorers. The early Disciples had little interest in church history except as it recorded the corruptions which had overcome the apostolic church, and they sincerely saw no reason why their own activities deserved any remembrance or glory. They sought to preach not themselves but Christ Jesus. When a concern for Disciple history manifested itself in a few staunch souls around 1900, they were often treated as if they were seeking to introduce into a Brotherhood mind which was to be kept pure for Christ a pre-occupation with earthly matters. In 1900, it was a lonely thing to be interested in Disciple history.

The present century has seen a number of factors working to enlarge the number of historians among the Disciples and to create an acceptability for them in their own communion. Large numbers of Disciples have come to realize that what was done by the founders of their movement did not so much restore a simon pure Christianity as make a "tradition" which influences present-day Disciple life and thought. The ecumenical movement, which has had the effect of sending all the groups of Christendom to a reconsideration

of their roots, has played its role. The increase of graduate students for the Disciple ministry has introduced the idea of careful research—and created among those students a search for dissertation topics which naturally has often led to topics in Disciple history.

For some years prior to 1954, the Christian Board of Publication had been urged to subsidize scholarly works on Disciple history for which only a limited market could be expected. For many years, the Board was able to resist the suggestion, for it was only a minor demand. By 1950 the demand had become irresistible. Soon thereafter the plans were launched which resulted in the policy announced in 1954 with the publication of five of the books reviewed in this article. When they appeared in October at the Miami Assembly of the International Convention of Disciples of Christ, the books carried as the symbol of the new series a cut of the octagonal brick study which Alexander Campbell built in the garden of his home at Bethany, West Virginia.

Three months later a more spectacular event occurred. In mid-1954, the Historical Society of Disciples of Christ launched a campaign for a building. It was expected that the campaign would take several years. Instead, within six months, the Society received a gift which assured the needed building.

The story of the Historical Society is further evidence of the rapid rise in our day of historical consciousness among Disciples of Christ. Prior to the appearance of the Society, the preservation of documents, relics and shrines by Disciples had been either a personal matter or the concern of a few schools. Local congregations were generally unconcerned to preserve their own histories. The denominational agencies and conventions, state and national, were not equally careful about preserving their records. There were no central archives or repository. The files of the many journals which Disciples had started existed in broken unbound sets in private attics. Col-

leges and seminaries showed some pride in developing historical collections of their own. A few individuals had accumulated collections of considerable importance, but these were privately owned. Research was badly hampered because of the scattered and haphazard condition of important materials.

The advent of a better state of affairs waited upon the appearance of a man with a special vocation. He emerged in the person of the librarian of Culver-Stockton College, Canton, Missouri, Mr. Claude E. Spencer. Throughout the thirties, Mr. Spencer enlarged the Disciple holdings of Culver-Stockton College. It was soon recognized that he was a man of rare archivistic skill with an undaunted devotion towards the records of his communion. Culver-Stockton College recognized the stature of Mr. Spencer's abilities, freed part of his time and loaned space for the assembly of a collection to be owned by an agency of the Disciple brotherhood. The significance of the possibilities attracted the historically-minded Disciples to Mr. Spencer, and the Historical Society came into existence in the early 1940s. Like other Disciple agencies, it could make no appeal to a general treasury for funds, but it had the blessings of the International Convention for raising funds.

By the end of the decade, the work of Mr. Spencer as the curator of the Society's collection, and the size of the collection, were more than Culver-Stockton could rightfully afford. A new and independent base of operations was needed, though the Society was not yet strong enough to launch out entirely on its own. At this point, a group of Disciples in Nashville, Tennessee, came forward with a proposal to underwrite partially the Society for an interim of five years, and, with the good offices of the Joint University Libraries on the campus of Vanderbilt University, to provide space for the collection during the interim, provided the Society would make its permanent home in Nashville. The plan was accepted; the Society offices and collec-

tion were moved. The gift insuring a permanent home of its own for the Society was announced in 1955; the cornerstone is laid in 1956, and the building will be dedicated in 1957.

This good fortune does not mean that the financial problems of the Society have been solved by any means. The Society still has to work very hard to accumulate its current fund each year. But the Disciples of Christ now look forward to the ownership of a properly designed and adequate center for the preservation of their historical documents by 1957. The Society has become the official repository for most Disciple of Christ agencies; its historical collection has become the most important in the denomination. For many years it has carried forward an educational program which has awakened the churches to their responsibility towards preserving their own history. The curator has compiled, edited, and seen published several significant lists such as the "periodicals published by Disciples," and "theses written on Disciple topics." He has also issued an author catalog of writings by and about Disciples which is of inestimable value in Disciple historical research. Other facilities which the Society makes available to researchers have rapidly increased. The development of the Society has re-stimulated interest in the preservation of the two principal Disciple shrines: the Campbell mansion at Bethany, West Virginia, and the Cane Ridge Meeting House outside Paris, Kentucky. Both of these shrines are in frail enough condition that if they are to be preserved adequately, it must be within the near future. It cannot be said that the development of historical concern among the Disciples has yet created a real safe-guard for their major shrines, nor an adequate level of activity for the Historical Society, but there seems to be a tide rising to the flood which augurs the bringing of these projects to safe harbor.

Among the activities of the Historical Society has been the publication of books. Dr. West's book on Barton Stone is the second volume brought

out by the Society through a Publication Fund founded by Mr. Forest F. Reed, a Nashville layman deeply devoted to the cause of Disciple history.

Three of the six books reviewed in this article point to another factor which has aided the development of historical consciousness among the Disciples of Christ. These three books had their first form as dissertations written at Yale University. Regarding the writing by doctoral aspirants of dissertations about their own communions, professors of church history, and the doctoral candidates, seem to be of two minds. Some feel that such writing will only add to a man's provincialism. Others feel that it provides an unusual opportunity for self-discovery. At Yale University, during the 1940s, Dean Luther Weigle espoused the latter view, and encouraged the dissertations which Drs. Walker, West, and Lunger were later to reconstruct into books for the Bethany History Series.

The Disciples of Christ have long since nominated Thomas and Alexander Campbell, Barton W. Stone and Walter Scott as their "founding fathers," and no others belong beside these four. Of the quartet, it is Alexander Campbell who has been the most studied, and who inevitably emerges as the greatest. The other three are not minor figures, and constantly need to be restudied. A good biography of Walter Scott entitled *The Voice of the Golden Oracle* was written a decade ago by Dr. D. L. Stevenson of Lexington, Kentucky. But biographies of Thomas Campbell and B. W. Stone were long over-due. Each of these men had been the subject of books written twenty years ago, but Drs. McAllister and West had access to much richer research materials than had been available to the earlier biographers.

Thomas Campbell deserved this new study which comes out on the eve of the sesquicentennial anniversary (1959) of his authorship of the *Declaration and Address* for the Christian Association of Washington, Pennsylvania. The work on Stone gives a sat-

isfying survey of his thought as well as his activities. But after the greatest possible claims for Thomas Campbell, Stone and Scott have been made, it is Alexander Campbell who towers over the others, a power and genius amidst three other men who were well above the mine-run but still not as gifted as he. There is one characteristic in common between Thomas Campbell and Barton Stone in which they seem to outrank Alexander Campbell. They were men of sweeter temper, and that temperament seems to indicate that they were more irenic. Certainly Alexander Campbell made more enemies than did his father or Barton Stone. But it is only fair to state that Alexander's passion for unity was the equal of the others. What Alexander Campbell had was a capacity for long-sustained firmness which enabled him to join issues more readily than the other men, and to develop a stomach for debate.

One must be careful not to belittle the courage of either Thomas Campbell or Barton Stone, nor to suggest that they were not men of principle. Both of them rose to the occasion of religious crisis and struck out in new directions of freedom. But neither of them had the capacity for that life-long devotion to religious creativity which Alexander Campbell displayed. Both McAllister and West seek to magnify the contributions of their subjects to the Disciples of Christ. Each man did help to loosen the bonds of the past. But the work of creating new structures within which the newfound freedom could express itself belongs peculiarly to Alexander Campbell.

The major lines of Thomas Campbell's thought were developed prior to his migration to America in 1807 at the age of forty-four. Dr. McAllister adequately reveals that Thomas Campbell's participation both by discussion and writing in the 1804 attempt to unite the Burgher and anti-Burgher Presbyterians of North Ireland was good preparation for what he was to accomplish for Christian unity through the Christian Association of Washington, Pennsylvania, in 1809. But it is

also obvious that Thomas Campbell had come to America seeking a better life, and for him that meant a life in which civil and religious strife were at a minimum. He had fled the divisions of the old world, and the discovery then that even in the new world there were divisions seems to have called forth from him only once, in 1809, a strong effort to find a new way forward to peace and unity. In some way, which his biographers have not yet fully probed, Thomas Campbell was a distraught soul. During his early maturity he wrote a diary which indicates a neuresthenic tendency. It was only in the very prime of life that he was able to accept something like leadership on behalf of Christian unity. What he did in 1809 when he became a center of controversy in Western Pennsylvania Presbyterianism has the full character of courage and nobility, but there is every evidence that he could not, in his own strength, carry forward the reformation which he had announced. During the next decade, at Cambridge, Ohio, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and Burlington, Kentucky, he succeeded in establishing excellent and profitable schools. But he had indifferent success at the ministry which was his first love, and largely because the inevitable controversies with respect to his position tended to create an atmosphere of discord which he found debilitating. When, in 1819, he discovered the extent of racial antipathies in Kentucky, he returned to the vicinity of his son's farm in western Virginia. Here he was able to live out a long and useful life as a very able assistant to his son, and with real happiness. His strong son carried the brunt of the battles that arose on the edges of his movement, and Thomas Campbell could labor earnestly within the citadel. Fundamentally a man of sweet temper, he had fought bravely for his principles when his irenic spirit led him to practice open communion among the Presbyterians in western Pennsylvania. But in the end he would have been defeated if his son had not arisen with all the vigor of youth and the added gifts of genius

to champion the new cause. Thomas Campbell made three great gifts to the Disciples of Christ. In a moment of crisis he followed the consequences through until the *Declaration and Address* was produced. Secondly, he contributed Alexander Campbell. The two men were exceedingly close and affectionate, and the father was the greatest single influence upon the son's development. Thirdly, he constantly strengthened the place of the Bible in the mentality of the new Disciple movement. Dr. McAllister subtitles his work *Man of the Book*. He therefore rightfully reminds present-day Disciples of the great importance of the Bible in their heritage. There has been a strong tendency in recent years to exalt the role of the frontier in shaping the Disciple mind. But the early Disciple mind was a biblically cultivated mind, and the kind of biblical cultivation which characterized it stemmed from Thomas Campbell. He was not a frontiersman, but an Irish Presbyterian immigrant. Like most immigrants he lacked roots, but had found an anchor. His mind was not merely equipped with texts. It was a cultured mind, and the Bible was the chief element of its culture. It was Thomas Campbell who taught the Disciples that they wanted to speak where the Bible speaks, and to call Bible things by Bible names. So complete was his immersion in Biblical ideas that they provided the perspective with which he approached every topic which his editor son assigned to him through their quarter century of editorial collaboration. Toward the end of his life, when Thomas Campbell was asked "What are the divinely appointed means for the enjoyment of salvation," the first point of his answer was, "A reverential, sincere, persevering, studious attention to the holy scriptures, in order to a clear apprehension and distinct retention of their doctrinal contents." It might almost be said that for Thomas Campbell, the Book had replaced the Christ. Certainly, he never was comfortable with the idea that on the basis of a simple confession and baptism, without pro-

found attention to scripture, men could be saved. In so far as Alexander Campbell argued for the primary place of the Bible in general education, both at the collegiate and lower levels, he was the son of his father, re-inforcing amongst Disciples of Christ, that which Thomas Campbell would most delight to see strengthened.

Dr. West, of Chattanooga, Tennessee, has written a book of impeccable scholarship and has significantly expanded our knowledge of Stone's activities, particularly in the period immediately following the union of the "Christians" and "Reformers" in 1832. There will always remain large gaps in the story of B. W. Stone. In contrast to the Campbells, Stone was a frontiersman, moving often, and leaving no accumulation of records at any one place.

Dr. West's thesis is that Barton Stone has been neglected by his own religious communion, and also by American church historians generally as a significant forerunner of one phase of the ecumenical movement in this country. There is some justification in the charge. It would be more correct, however, to say that historians in general have allowed the dominance of Alexander Campbell's role among the mid-Western Disciples after 1832 to obscure the significance of the "Christian Church" movement from New England to Virginia and North Carolina and into Kentucky in the period from 1790 to 1830. That Christian Church movement was "grass-roots ecumenism" on the American frontier, and Stone did play an important role in its Kentucky and Ohio River developments. Proper justice to it as an expression of Christian unity has never been done, and may never be done, since every part of that movement has now been merged into other denominations. A study of the rise of the movement, and particularly of its final dispersion into other communions might indicate the characteristics of the movement which prevented it from becoming an enduring force. Certainly, Barton Stone was typical of the movement at its

height, though he never played the singularly dominant role within it which Alexander Campbell played among the Disciples.

In 1932, Dr. E. E. Snoddy of Lexington, Kentucky, asserted that in comparison to Campell, to Stone belongs priority in time, priority in American experience, priority in the ideal of unity, priority in the independence of his movement, priority in the complete repudiation of the Calvinistic system of theology. Advocates of Stone make much of this primacy. But it is rather like the morning-star primacy of Wicliffe and Hus in relation to Luther. It is true that Stone was an early American advocate of Christian unity. But the limits of his leadership are obvious. As Dr. West makes clear, he was not the author, but only a co-signer of "The Last Will and Testament of the Springfield Presbytery." His leadership among the Kentucky and Ohio Valley Christians became strongest after the movement was well established. He did not succeed in bringing the "eastern" Christians into the Campbell-Stone union of 1832, and not all of the "western" Christians. It is true that his doctrinal position was similar to Campbell's at those points to which Stone had given deep consideration, but he did not have the kind of comprehensive vigor with respect to doctrinal study which enabled Alexander Campbell to produce *The Christian System*.

The strength of Stone lay in his honesty and sincerity, rather than in his personal force. As a young man he was far more objective about the consequences of the Second Great Awakening than were many others who were involved with him in it. Christian unity did become his polar star—but he did not have enough other navigational equipment to make an outstanding contribution to the ecumenical ideal in his day. He could face the harsh personal and economic consequences of his disagreement with Presbyterian doctrine. He seems to have had unusual powers for winning personal commitments to Christianity and for fostering an irenic spirit in

congregations. He yearned for a conference to be held at some central point in America for consultation upon general points respecting the union of Christians, and suggested such a conference through his magazine. But he did not have a "Plan of Union" as did the Presbyterians and Congregationalists, nor a "plea" as did the Campbells, nor S. S. Schmucker's capacity for concrete proposals. He could free men's spirits and nourish local peace, but he lacked the architectonic skill which enabled Alexander Campbell to lead the building of a denomination. The frontier was his home, and of all the early Disciples leaders he was most bound to it. He was born in tidewater Maryland, educated in the North Carolina Piedmont, spent his prime in blue-grass Kentucky and his final days in western Illinois. Frontiersmen were the sheep of this shepherd, and he followed his flock. But they were always in wilderness fields where the ground was being cleared, and when the more complicated structures of community were required, and an apprehension of Christianity that would inspire them, Barton Stone moved on west.

Barton Stone has deserved the record of his contribution to Disciple history which this book affords, and Disciples should continue with the conservation of the primary scenes of his endeavors. Yet the book is not definitive. First, it does not really explain why Stone led his people into the union with Campbell's followers, when he knew that the latter were somewhat more pre-occupied with doctrine than were Stone's followers. Did Stone sense that in some way a more advanced civilization would call for a more structured ideology, and did he sense that Campbell was the man who could provide it? Secondly, the book does not provide the context in which Stone's ecumenical significance can be fully judged. That context will be the story of the Christian Church movement of 1790 to 1830. That story may not easily be written for no continuing denomination today specifically nourishes the memory of the whole of the

Christian Church movement. In all probability, it was the most widespread expression of Christian unity in its day, and Stone had an important role in it, though he was not its fountain as the Campbell's were the source of their movement. When the story of the Christian Church is recovered in order that Stone can be seen in relation to it, his true ecumenical stature will be correctly assessable.

Circumstances robbed Alexander Campbell of a university education. They robbed him of little else. Yet it cannot be denied that such an education might have provided him with a breadth of perspective upon the problems of human association, particularly in churches, which he was to gain only through experience. Alexander Campbell emerged in his twenties as a strong preacher, an astute manager of the farm properties that came to him through marriage, and a man of parts in every sense of the word. He yet remains to be appreciated as a religious leader—for he was much more than a churchman. He was a patriarch, not a bishop. He defied our modern divisions of labor and exercised leadership in ecclesiastical, political, educational, and economic spheres. By the age of thirty-five he added to his already busy life a habit of writing which has left behind a major corpus (mostly in periodical form) not yet appropriated by American religion in general and thoroughly known only to a handful of Disciples of Christ. He was a thoroughly dependable leader, as no other early Disciple was. When his people needed a new version of the New Testament, he produced it. He was there when they needed a new hymn-book, a concise summary of their doctrinal position, the public defence in debate of particular tenets. Usually he sensed his followers' needs before they did. He was a many-sided person, and the Disciples will always have to restudy him—usually one facet at a time as Dr. Walker and Dr. Lunger have done. Their books on preaching and political ethics in the thought of Campbell should be read by all Disciples who want to understand themselves, and

by any one else who wants to understand the Disciples.

By virtue of its topic, Dr. Walker's book surpasses Dr. Lunger's in so far as the former contributes to the understanding of a strong element in the Disciple make-up while the latter deals with an area in which Disciples are more confused.

When a new religious movement emerges, its initial success does not depend upon the availability of an articulate and well-systematized theology, but it does depend on the availability of a homiletical model which will serve for the popular dissemination of its message or plea. Systematizing, if it occurs at all, usually follows sermonizing. Among Disciples of Christ it is often asserted that Alexander Campbell contributed the theology, while Walter Scott contributed the sermons. Dr. Walker's book restores to Alexander Campbell his primacy as the homiletical fountain of the Disciple movement. What Scott was able to do was to simplify and popularize certain major themes which Campbell worked out, but Campbell had been preaching those themes for a full decade before Scott gave them his particular variation, and Campbell continued to influence Disciple preaching long after Scott's star was in decline.

To point to Campbell as the fountain of Disciple homiletics is not to assert that he developed a "barrel" of sermons to which lesser men repaired. It is to assert that he was responsible for devising the method and style which came to typify Disciple preaching in the last century, and which, to an amazing degree, still typifies it today. Not only was Campbell responsible for devising method and style; he elucidated the function of preaching and its source materials. He defined the relation of the minister to the congregation, and designed an appropriate ministerial education which he institutionalized first in a seminary and later in Bethany College. And what he did was all of a piece.

Dr. Walker's book is written with

great felicity, and is, to use the vocabulary of literary criticism, "close textured." This quality of Dr. Walker's style, while creditable to him, reflects also the subject matter of his book, for in Campbell preacher and theologian were one.

For Campbell, the function of preaching was to present to the mind of the reader the facts which constitute the testimony to the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth. The mood of preaching is therefore reasonable or rationalistic, and not emotional, since what is presented is a case to be argued in terms of facts, not of feelings. Religious experience had no place in Campbell's theology, and his understanding of the Christian message called for a preaching markedly different from the wide-spread emotionalism of the "experimental" religion of his day. The content of preaching is Christ and the God who sends him. But this biblical material is to be handled as historical evidence. What must be presented is biblical episodes. Here Campbell departed from the proof-texting of doctrinal tenets, though not all of his followers were able to appropriate his kind of treatment of the grand themes of the faith.

With respect to the relation of the preacher to the congregation, after an initial period in which he doubted the validity of a paid professional ministry, he reached a position which is in most respects similar to that of other congregational denominations. The ministry is commissioned or ordained by the church, not by an order of the clergy. The preaching ministry is the most sublime of vocations, but the substance of a call to the ministry comes through the congregation. Campbell believed in a three-fold order of the ministry—a fact which would surprise most of his latter day followers if they knew it. The three orders were deacon, elder or bishop, and evangelist. All the orders were to be found within a single congregation, however. In his later days, Campbell realized that a single congregation might make serious mistakes. He sought for some kind of

inter-congregational guidance of a more presbyterial kind, but these thoughts came too late to influence a denomination which was already molded in a more strictly congregational way and was beginning to read Campbell's original position in terms of a radical autonomy of the local congregation.

With respect to ministerial education, Campbell urged that the ministerial student be educated in the same institution as other young men, and that they all share a similar curriculum. This curriculum combined biblical, classical and scientific elements, a remarkable instance of what a later age calls general education, and more general than most twentieth century proposals because of the equal balance given by Campbell to biblical and classical learning. Late in his career, Campbell admitted the need of specialization in homiletics for the ministerial student, and a more intense study of the Bible, but to the end he stood for a pattern of ministerial education which would keep it, as would be said today, in the context of the university.

The comprehensiveness and tightly reasoned character of Campbell's thoughts on preaching gave his homiletical advice and example a power over his followers and their descendants. It is an influence which has withstood the inroads of nineteenth century revivalism, of the moralism of the lesser forms of liberalism, and the rigors of biblical fundamentalism, and the particular doctrinal pre-occupations of the new orthodoxy. To this day, the typical Disciple sermon is a plain-spoken discourse centered on the historical career of Jesus of Nazareth as testimony regarding the things that are divine.

Dr. Lunger's treatise on the political ethics of Alexander Campbell was in many respects a difficult work to write. Where Dr. Walker was dealing with an area in which Campbell displayed integrity, Dr. Lunger deals with an area in which Campbell displays, if not schizophrenia, at least a loose relationship between two strong tendencies. The success of Dr. Lunger's work

is that he has been able to isolate these two strong tendencies from each other and identify them. An ordinary reading of Campbell is likely to leave the impression that he approached each ethical problem afresh as it arose without recourse to some general understanding. Fortunately, ecclesiastical and political studies of recent years have provided insights which Dr. Lunger astutely applies to Campbell's thought. Dr. Lunger identifies in Campbell's ecclesiastical thought a movement from rationalistic left-wing sectarianism to something akin to typical American denominationalism. In the socio-political sphere, Campbell was primarily a Jacksonian, particularly in the earlier period of his life when he served on the Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1829-30. During the early period he was fiercely democratic with respect to both church and state. His church democracy was based on his understanding of the Bible. His social democracy was based on the natural law concepts of British seventeenth century philosophy. His early sectarian tendency often led him to advise his followers to restrict their political activity, but when he was urged to stand for election to a constitutional convention he found a good reason for over-riding sectarian scruples. The real reason was that the scope of the convention's concerns appealed to him. Campbell believed in the separation of church and state; but his understanding of each was nourished by different presuppositions, and never throughout his life did he effect a real harmony between his ecclesiastical and political thought. In his later days they seemed to approach each other as he became more conservative in each realm, and in some respect each conservatism was fed from the common source of a mild disillusion with the common man. But to the end of his days, the relationship of the church to the state was understood in terms of a church preparing men of a right spirit but not contributing to them any particular insights regarding political life. On specific issues like war or slavery he might search the scriptures, but with

respect to the structure of the state he turned to other sources for enlightenment. In both his ecclesiastical and political thinking Alexander Campbell matured as the frontier matured. But his mind had fundamentally been shaped in an era when religious and political thought could be disjointed without great embarrassment. He did not bequeath anything better to his followers. Perhaps this explains why, in the realm of social ethics, there is a halting tendency among the Disciples of Christ. In the face of today's social and political complexities they have to go well beyond their tradition for significant guidance, and this their tradition does not teach them to do. Dr. Lunger has written a book which deals with one of the most fascinating aspects of Alexander Campbell, and one which describes some of the more romantic episodes of his life, but he did not work out in detail the vital relationship which existed between Campbell's religion and social life.

The study of D. S. Burnet by Dr. Noel Kieth of Fort Worth, Texas, is the first study to be made of a man who had fallen into undeserved obscurity. His fame was reduced to a single line or two in general histories which recognized him as a key-figure in the formation of the first national agencies of the Disciple brotherhood. The reasons for according him the designation of a "key-figure" were not detailed. Dr. Kieth has recovered the story and restored a rightful stature to the memory of D. S. Burnet. So long as Alexander Campbell lived, the geographical focus of the Disciples of Christ was his homestead in the hills of the western Virginia pan-handle. When Campbell declined in physical power, the focus moved out of the hills toward a metropolitan center. That Cincinnati succeeded Bethany as the new focal point was because D. S. Burnet had prepared the ground. It is even more important that by creating the first national agencies of the Disciples of Christ, Burnet, more than any other man, prepared the structures by which the movement grew beyond

its sectarian stage into the denominational mould.

Why did so constructive and influential a leader fall into obscurity? This is a historian's question, and Dr. Kieth makes profitable suggestions as he answers it. In the case of Burnet, Dr. Kieth identifies five factors which lead to the obscuring of his memory: 1. The scattering and inadequate preservation of his writings; 2. His proximity in life and in death to the great leader of the movement, Alexander Campbell; 3. His lack of children of his own who might have passed along the family story; 4. His genesis from a family of other illustrious persons; 5. His advocacy of ideas a century ahead of their general acceptance.

Certainly, Dr. Kieth has proven that Burnet's obscurity was undeserved. There are many less memorable Disciples who have actually been better remembered. What Dr. Kieth does not adequately sense is the real nature of the conflict that arose between Campbell and Burnet at the time when the first national agencies of the Disciples came into being. D. S. Burnet had a right instinct when he knew that the brotherhood which was centered on the person of Campbell would eventually center in institutions. Burnet was the chief architect of those institutions. But Campbell knew that in some way the brotherhood was not yet ready to shift the center of its practical loyalties. There can be no question that with respect to publishing enterprises, Campbell and Burnet were competitors. But with respect to the Missionary Society and Convention which Burnet designed, there was no competition for Campbell. Indeed, he accepted the presidency of these organizations. What Campbell did not do with respect to them was to give himself ardently to them; nor did he give them powerful commendation. Burnet was not a century ahead of his time. He was fifteen years too soon, and Alexander Campbell sensed it. But he could not will the one event, namely his death, which would free his followers to regroup themselves around an institution and become more than a

sect. While Campbell did not destroy the institutions which Burnet brought into existence, he did not give them any high degree of visibility, yet there was the highest regard for each other between these men. When Campbell died, it was Burnett who was called to Bethany to give the leading memorial addresses.

Dr. Kieth has written an affectionate as well as an accurate account of Burnet's life. Perhaps the best service he has done is to recover from obscurity of convention minutes the "Address to the Churches" which Burnet composed in 1849 following the formation of the American Christian Missionary Society. It is evidence of the early existence amongst Disciples of a strong spirit of co-operation, of a sense that beyond the limits of local congregations there was an "associated strength" to be realized. While it does not look toward the formation of an "ecclesiastical body" it is a fine expression of churchly consciousness at a time when American sectarianism was giving way to American denominationalism.

Georgia is not a state in which the Disciples have been strong, but J. Edward Moseley's history of the Disciples of Christ in Georgia is a fine example of the way in which denominational state histories might be written. The state history of any denomination is usually too small a segment of history to intrigue a truly competent historian, and too complex for the skills of the devoted amateur. As a consequence, many denominational state histories are among the worst possible kind of historical writing. This history of Georgia Disciples has been saved the usual fate. The nucleus of the history was a manuscript begun about 1901 by a Mrs. B. O. Miller. It was worked upon from time to time, and enlarged in the 1940s at the instigation of one of the associations of Georgia Disciple church women, some of whom contributed further data. In the late forties, the Christian Board of Publication was presented with a conglomeration of material and some

funds to underwrite its publication. The Board wisely commissioned J. E. Moseley of Indianapolis to rework the material. The necessary extent of Mr. Moseley's labors warrants his designation as author of the book, since the earlier materials became primary sources rather than manuscripts to be edited. The resulting history bears the necessary marks of a state history in that it is still largely a source book, replete with tables, biographical sketches, and at points as intimate as the chit-chat after Sunday morning service, or as harrowing as Sherman's march to the sea which plays its role in the story.

What is the collective meaning of these new histories and the new Bethany History Series? One meaning is certainly that the enlargement and stability of the Disciples denomination is making it possible for the denomination to afford historical research. Another meaning is that when they encounter internal problems today, Disciples make an honest attempt to discover what earlier Disciples have said. In other words, Disciples are admitting that they have a tradition which has shaped them, and in some sense they want to possess it. Thirdly, these writings all reflect some concern to bring the Disciples into a better relationship than they have had with the ecumenical movement. It is to be expected that increasingly in the future, the demands of ecumenical life will influence the character of the Disciples inquiry into their own past. In that respect, nearly all Disciple history so far (with the exception of the writing of W. E. Garrison) seems to be written against too shallow and narrow a background. Disciple historians write lucidly and clearly regarding the internal disputes of the denomination as it has developed. They even do respectably in understanding the arguments which early Disciples had with men of other denominations. But Disciples historians do not really write Disciple history in the context of American church history as a whole, nor within the context of the history of the whole church. They write Dis-

ciple church history from the Disciple perspective, not from an ecumenical perspective. Perhaps the ability to write denominational history from an ecumenical perspective will only be vouchsafed to a generation yet to come.

The major value of the present enterprise is that it may allow Disciples to make strides toward an ecumenical point of view. For all their yearning after Christian unity, the Disciples have lacked an ecumenical perspective. In other words, they have had a feeling for Christian unity; they have lacked an ideological structure by which to lay hold of it. In some respects, the Disciples today are like Thomas Campbell and Barton Stone of old. They want unity, but they cannot fully articulate it. They need a new Alexander Campbell, or his counterpart in co-operative theological inquiry, to provide a sinewy structure of religious and ecclesiastical ideas.

The recovery of the history of Disciples of Christ is significant only if it contributes toward the ecumenical aim of the Disciples. That it has been doing. In ecumenical conversations, until recent times, the Disciples have been relatively inarticulate. Their silence now seems to have resulted largely from their lack of a normative theological position of their own which they could use as a foil in ecumenical debate. In recent decades, the Disciples of Christ have been somewhat anti-theological. Liberal Disciples have feared that the theologies of the past might bind and hamper them. Disciples of Christ have made so much of the individual's right to do his own religious thinking, that they have not recognized the values of some common point of view which, by common consent, might act as a landmark in terms of which they could figure out their present positions when confronting men of other denominations.

The greatest value of the contemporary development of historical consciousness among Disciples is that it is shaping a "tradition" which can be used as the norm by which Disciples can measure and judge the meaning of contrasting points of view as they

are presented in ecumenical discussion. The recovery of the tradition is by no means complete. There are other facets of Alexander Campbell yet to be studied. The work of striving to round out the story of Barton Stone must go on. Above all, a grand full-scale portrait and interpretation of Alexander Campbell must come to fruition. Not until that kind of justice is done to its past will the Disciple brotherhood be free enough and self-conscious enough to make significant contribution to the contemporary ecumenical developments.

It is important to notice, however, that well before the historical tide reaches its flood, a Disciple theological renaissance is following in its wake. There are several indications of this, notably some new books in preparation for the Bethany Press. In 1952, the World Convention of Disciples of Christ launched a series of study groups instructed to report on a variety of theological topics at the 1955

Toronto Assembly of the Convention. The reports were given at breakfast sessions which attracted several times the number of expected participants. Thirdly, with each succeeding ecumenical conference, the Disciples have made greater and greater use of their "tradition" in preparing a "Response" to the findings of the conference. The denomination is growing out of the condition in which it was unable to participate in discussions because it did not know where it stood, to a point where it knows how to use its tradition as an instrument whereby it can engage in discussion. This instrumental usage of tradition is something very different from a dogmatic usage of it. It is a use of tradition, not for tradition's sake, but for the sake of providing a base from which one can step to the new and ecumenical forms which Christian theology is seeking. It is to be hoped that all future writing by Disciple historians will contribute to this ecumenical function of tradition.

BOOK REVIEWS

The English Mediaeval Parish Church. By C. H. Cook. London, Phoenix House Ltd. and New York, MacMillan Co., 1954, 302 pp., 188 photos, 54 plans, \$7.50.

The English parish church, even more than the cathedral, was connected by innumerable ties with the life of the mediaeval community. The work here reviewed is the first comprehensive treatment of the subject within a generation. Mr. Cook, well known as the author of a number of fine monographs on English cathedrals, has considered the medieval parish church not only as an architectural historian, but has paid almost equal attention to many other aspects of his subject that are of unusual interest to the ecclesiastical and even to the social historian.

What will surprise many readers is the part which the mediaeval parish church played in the purely secular life of the community. In the 16th century a preacher complained that "... many country folk who keep certain gild commemorations come together on certain days of the year and hold their feasts within the church, perchance because they have no houses large enough to hold so great a company, and thus with a surfeiting and drunkenness and other filthiness they do profane the sanctuary of God." [p. 31] Again, we are told "... At Christmas, Easter, Whitsuntide and other festivals parish feasts known as church-ales were held in the nave of the church. The ale was made in the parish brewhouse ... a church ale was the occasion of feasting and merrymaking and was followed by dancing in the church. The parishioners paid for the ale they consumed, and out of the profits certain sums were earmarked for any necessary repairs of the church, for providing the poor brides of the parish with dowries and distributing alms to the poor." [p. 28] One document suggests to Mr. Cook that a maypole dance may actually

have taken place in the nave of a church.

Of course, the cathedrals too had a vastly more important place in the life of mediaeval society than they have today. But the parish church, just because the townspeople—individuals and guilds—were responsible for its building, decoration and upkeep, was considered part of their world and daily life, as the cathedral, certainly the Norman cathedral, never was. In the parish church, "... the burgesses congregated to hear and discuss affairs concerning the well-being of the town" [p. 34], and we even find the ritual attuned to the needs of the common folk. Chantry certificates contain frequent endorsements for a mass "... every morning before sunrise for ... travellers by the way." [p. 35]. The piety of travellers accounts likewise for the frequent representations of St. Christopher, since the mere sight of such an image was thought to be protection against the perils of the road. [p. 199].

The deep attachment of mediaeval man to his parish church was undoubtedly responsible for the great age and survival of so many of these sanctuaries. It is astonishing to learn that, while "in the fabric of the cathedrals and abbeys there is nothing above ground that is the work of Saxon craftsmen ..." about three hundred stone churches of the pre-Conquest period survive, in whole or in part, even today. [p. 41]. In these ancient structures we encounter a number of features—such as the square ending of the chancel or the two-celled plan consisting of a nave and presbytery of nearly equal size—that have remained typical of English church architecture to the end of the Middle Ages.

The mediaeval parish churches tell the story of architecture in much simpler language than do the cathedrals. On the whole, parochial Gothic is but a modest adaptation of those

more magnificent edifices. No revolutionary change in either form or structure had its origin in the parish church, while, conversely, a large cathedral or monastic church often proved a source of inspiration to the less skilled builder of smaller churches in the same neighborhood. What renders so many English parish churches worthy of our attention, however, is not only their venerable age but the often exquisite furniture that they preserve. And in addition to their artistic quality, these fittings are often of considerable interest to the church historian. Thus, the appearance of fixed seats toward the end of the fourteenth century [p. 86] surely reflects the increasing importance of the sermon in the religious service of the late Middle Ages.

In the Benedictine Abbey Church of Sherborne, Dorset, the nave was used by the parishioners till the middle of the 14th Century, when, owing to constant quarrels with the monks, the former decided to build a church of their own attached to the west front of the Abbey church. The monks responded by walling up the south portal of the west front and inserting a smaller doorway in order to exclude the laity from their church. In 1436 further trouble developed when the monks refused to surrender the baptismal font. Matters reached a head when the vicar of the parish church shot a fiery shaft into the thatched roof of the Abbey church. "The fire blazed so furiously that the bells in the tower were melted and the choir reduced to a smoking ruin. . . . The townspeople of Sherborne were made to contribute towards the cost of rebuilding, and, as a warning against further feuds, the bosses of the choir vault were carved with fiery arrows." [p. 65]

Such quarrels reflect the increasing estrangement between the secular and regular clergy and between laity and clergy, the estrangement which in the 16th century came to its final crisis. In his last chapter Mr. Cook recounts the tragic fate of the English parish church during the Reformation: "the

foulest and most inhumane action was the violation of funeral monuments; tombs hakt and hewn apieces . . . for greediness of the brasse" [p. 265]. Such acts of vandalism left many a church in the eyes of the common people, as Bernard Gilpin, the famous presbyter of Durham, put it in a sermon of 1552, "as good as a barn." Occasionally, however, the parishioners were able to save their churches, and even the naves of many monastic sanctuaries owe their survival to their parochial status prior to the Suppression.

Some minor errors call for correction. The "action and gesture of a priest celebrating high mass" are certainly not "essentially histrionic" [p. 170] Mr. Cook is too ready to underestimate the symbolic aspects of mediaeval church architecture. "The belief that the ground north of the church was the domain of the evil one . . ." is not "an ecclesiological fancy of the nineteenth century" [p. 96]. Lucifer's words, "I will sit in the mountain of the Covenant in the side of the north" [Is. 14:13] had a profound and well attested influence on mediaeval symbolism. Again, the symbolic connection between the cruciform church plan and the Christian cross is not the nonsensical invention of modern enthusiasts but can be traced back as far as the fourth century. Nor can the transept tower be accounted for merely by the fact that it provided walls against which the roofs of the chancel, the nave and the transept abutted [p. 133]. And it is not generally true that the sole purpose of the transept was "to furnish space for much-needed altars," [p. 103] or that the "High Altar was always placed at the east end of the chancel" [p. 164].

With reference to images of St. Christopher, Mr. Cook seems to give undue credit to Caxton's *Golden Legend*, the English version of which appeared in 1483 [p. 199]. In point of fact, this pictorial theme, like the original *Golden Legend*, belongs of course to the thirteenth century. Finally, I wonder what prompts the au-

thor to identify the well known stone carving of a centaur fighting a dragon on a capital in the church of Adel near Leeds as St. Michael. [p. 213]

But such peccadillos are very minor flaws in a book that scholar and tourist alike will find illuminating. An admirable set of illustrations reproduces not only many fine churches but also such details as roof construction, the fabric and materials of the parish church, and the development of such typically English features as the rood screen.

OTTO G. VON SIMSON
University of Chicago.

English Historical Documents c. 500-1042. Edited by DOROTHY WHITELOCK, New York: Oxford University Press, 1955. xxiv, 867 pp. \$12.80.

This is Volume I of a projected thirteen-volume (Volume XII is in two parts) set of the fundamental sources of English history from A. D. 500 to 1914, under the general editorship of David C. Douglas. Miss Whitelock's work erects a high standard for the collection. It is divided into three parts, of which the first consists of "Secular Narrative Sources," the second of "Charters and Laws," and the third of "Ecclesiastical Sources," following the loose scheme of political history, administration and social life, and the history of the church, education, and scholarship.

An excellent hundred-page Introduction discussing the sources and history of the period is followed by four or five pages of valuable select bibliography with critical comments. Each selection has its own brief introduction and bibliography together with extensive annotation. A good map of Anglo-Saxon England is provided. Unfortunately the Index is too scanty, but that is partially rectified, I suppose, by the elaborate table of Contents.

In the nature of things it is probably inevitable that the longest selections are the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the*

English Nation, each occupying about a hundred pages. The presentation of the *Chronicle* is particularly good. Based on six major manuscripts plus certain variations from minor manuscripts, it is set forth in columns so that one may note the differences. Miss Whitelock has gone far toward identifying all place-names mentioned in the *Chronicle*. As always, Bede, in whatever version, casts his spell over the reader.

Perhaps the most important (but also, I cannot refrain from saying, the dullest) section is Part II, the "Charters and Laws." Let Miss Whitelock's own justification for including them be sufficient. "They tell us," she writes,

of the relations between the kingdoms of the Heptarchy, and show that a Bretwalda was an overlord in more than his title; they afford incidental information on the effects of the viking invasions and shed occasional light on the policy of English kings towards the Danish settlers; they are indispensable for the study of ecclesiastical history, not only enabling us to supplement the history of the episcopal sees and the great abbeys, but informing us of the existence of otherwise unknown communities; they supplement the laws and let us see them in action . . . ; the economic historian cannot dispense with their evidence on agrarian arrangements, or on the salt and lead industries, or with their occasional references to trade and town life; something can be learnt from them as regards the standards of material culture, and some of them bring us into close touch with men and women of the time.

ALLEN CABANISS
University of Mississippi

Studies in Literature and Belief. By MARTIN JARRETT-KERR, C. R. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955. xi, 203 pp. \$2.75.

One of the most interesting aspects of British literary culture at the present time grows out of the remarkable insurgence of activity in criticism that has been gathering over the past fifteen years amongst a sizeable group of Anglican writers, many of whom give promise of achieving real distinction. There is, of course, a tradition of long standing in the Anglican establishment of sound literary scholar-

ship: in the last century it was represented by such men as Richard Trench and Dean Church and R. W. Dixon, and though today, when we think of Christian literary intellectuals on the British scene, we are apt first to think of Roman Catholic writers like Graham Greene and Martin Turnell and Fr. D'Arcy, we should also be aware that this Anglican tradition is itself being ably continued. There is, to be sure, the magisterial figure of Mr. T. S. Eliot, of whom at the present moment we are likely to be too mindful. But then there are also many others: there is Dorothy Sayers, whose contributions to Dante scholarship are among the most important of our time: there is C. S. Lewis, whose most important work is not to be found in his popular theological essays but in his literary criticism (his fine study of *Paradise Lost*, for example) and his essays in literary history (notably his recent monumental study of the sixteenth century); or, again, there is the distinguished Elizabethan scholar S. L. Bethell, who in recent years has been greatly concerned to make applications of theological categories to issues in modern criticism; and one also thinks of Brother George Every, by profession a church historian connected with the House of the Sacred Mission at Kelham, who has also done fine work in literary criticism. And there are many others whose work might be mentioned: the point is, though, that for a long time there has been and still is alive on the British scene what is only just now beginning to come into existence in America—namely, a tradition of distinctively Christian literary scholarship growing out of the work of both lay and clerical writers.

Now amongst these figures in Britain today one of the most important is the Anglican priest Fr. Martin Jarrett-Kerr (currently doing a tour of duty for his order, the Community of the Resurrection, as Vice-Principal of a theological college in Johannesburg). It is to Jarrett-Kerr that we are indebted for a splendid translation of Wladimir Weidlé's *Les Abeilles*

d'Aristée (The Dilemma of the Arts, SCM, 1948), one of the profoundest Christian analyses in contemporary literature of modern movements in poetry and painting. In 1951 he gave us his first major book, a study of D. H. Lawrence (*D. H. Lawrence and Human Existence*, published under the pseudonym Fr. William Tiverton, London, Rockliff), which is possibly the finest essay on its subject that has yet been written. And, more recently, he has given us a searching study of the French Catholic novelist François Mauriac (*Mauriac*, Yale, 1954).

In his latest book he turns to one of the most frequently examined issues in modern literary discussion: the extent to which the imaginative writer's beliefs fulfill an executive role in the determination of the character of the literary projects which he undertakes. And his way of turning a searchlight upon this complex problem is to forego theoretical definition for empirical analysis and to focus upon five different types of relationship between art and belief that have in fact existed in the work of significantly representative figures in the tradition. The patterns that he studies are as follows: "The Ballad and Society, or the Assimilation of Belief"; "Calderón and the Imperialism of Belief"; "Manzoni's *I Promessi Sposi*, or the Quiescence of Belief"; "Dostoevsky and the Agony of Belief"; and "C. F. Ramuz, or the Analogy of Belief." Then, in a final chapter, he looks at certain contemporary writers—Bernanos, Claudel, Greene, Mauriac, Bazin and Supervielle—whose great problem, as men of belief, is that of making an adjustment to "the erosion of the imaginative soil" in our period and of discovering ways, as artists, of speaking affirmatively about human life in a relativistic age. And in all these studies Jarrett-Kerr employs with brilliant adeptness all those techniques of close textual analysis which modern critical practice has today led us to take for granted in literary discussion.

The over-all strategy of the book is that of "comparative literature,"

and this Jarrett-Kerr has deliberately chosen because of his settled conviction that the Christian faith, which is the historic mode of faith in the West, "is not a univocal concept at every moment in history" and that therefore "it is impossible to discuss, simply and univocally, 'the relationship of belief to literature.'" Since there have been so many such relationships the only way of discussing them is historical." And certainly he is right in feeling that, apart from this kind of study of what in fact have been the varied relationships between literature and belief, "we shall never be able to draw conclusions either about the whole of the past, or about the confusing present, still less about the tentative future." Yet one feels that, as a theological critic who presumably regards the quality of belief that figures in a given poetic enterprise as a radically decisive factor in the determination of its ultimate character, Jarrett-Kerr's own brand of relativism does really, in effect, preclude the distinctive types of discrimination which one supposes it to be the special office of the theological critic to make. For he comes down so hard upon his insistence that "it is impossible to discuss... univocally 'the relationship of belief to literature'" that he seems finally to put himself in the position of having to be merely a kind of phenomenologist with respect to literary history, who can point first in one direction to one pattern of belief in literature and then in another direction to still another but who finds it impossible to make any really significant *judgments* about them. Indeed, the broadest ultimate implications of his critical position are such as would finally make it impossible even to talk about poetry or the novel, but only about poetries and novels, each poet and each novelist having to be judged only in terms of his own individual sensibility and outlook. And, of course, at this point the very enterprise of literary criticism disappears altogether. So it may well be, then, that the admirable modesty and tact that have led Jarrett-Kerr to want to

suppress here the slightest suggestion that he uses his own beliefs as a kind of yardstick with which to measure the success or failure of imaginative writers—and had this been his stance it would really have been disabling—have, in turn, created new problems with which he must deal more thoroughly than he has done on this occasion.

But let there be no doubt about it: this is a brilliant, vigorously written, and bracing book that has enormous relevance to all the questions which in our day Christian critics are facing, and it is a book that deserves a wide and appreciative audience.

NATHAN A. SCOTT, JR.
University of Chicago

The Religious Orders in England.
Volume II: The End of the Middle Ages. By DOM DAVID KNOWLES.
New York: Cambridge University Press, 1955. \$8.50.

This second volume brings to completion what must now be classified as the standard reference for English monasticism in the Middle Ages. In the present volume every significant phase of late medieval monastic life for which sufficient evidence remains passes under critical review. Much of the matter represents spade work on the part of the author, although a study as comprehensive and definitive as this must necessarily draw heavily upon the careful research of other scholars. These Professor Knowles is ever ready to commend, and if in his scrutiny of their monographs he discovers something which cannot pass as "proved," he criticizes with a light hand. While Professor Knowles approaches his task with sympathy, he is no apologist. Unlike either Coulton or Gasquet, he needs no corrective. Though himself a monk, when referring to the eminent abbot of St. Albans, Thomas De La Mare, he notes without hesitation that "had many thus lived in the days of Henry VIII their order would not have passed, and would not have deserved to pass, so easily from the English scene." Were

Professor Knowles even less the great scholar that he is, his aim to preserve, not glorify, the monastic order, would prevent his coloring or obscuring the truth. Thus both historian and monk can read his volume with profit.

The volume is divided somewhat arbitrarily into two parts, the first entitled "The Historical Framework," the second "The Institutional Background." Despite serious and repeated efforts by the papacy to revitalize monasticism, which the author considers in his opening chapter, the "rhythm of the monastic life shows, during the three centuries, a slow but continuous tendency to slacken." Toward this development the Black Death contributed; it was not the cause. The chapter dealing with monastic members in attendance at the university reveals papal anxiety to encourage higher studies, at the same time admitting that eight years or more away from his community left the monk a better scholar, hardly a better monk. Monastic patrons and architects come in for consideration, as do a number of significant though relatively unknown monastic figures such as Thomas De La Mare whose saintliness, because it was authentic, was of a type which would escape the prying eyes of a Langland or Chaucer. Professor Knowles' prying eyes, by contrast, are unable to discover much evidence to support Chaucer's portrait of the monk Nimrod. Modern scholars of all walks do well to read of the controversies over grace, dominion, and apostolic poverty which reverberated through the halls of the late medieval university, before which their own opinions, proposed under the hallowed aegis of modern academic freedom, pale into platitudes. But the late medieval university failed woefully in providing a stimulant to the spiritual life of the times. Several chapters cover developments within the different orders and disclose, together with a mass of significant information, the startling fact that the only order to grow in numbers and fervor in late

medieval England was the most rigorous, the Carthusian. There are valuable chapters treating of such matters as the monastic population, its recruitment, the employment of the members of the community, the election of superiors (almost universally free of secular interference), the monastic economy, libraries, chronicles, monasticism's obligations to society, and the growing weight of administrative and civil business which threatened to extinguish the spiritual character of the abbot's supervision. A chapter "In Retrospect," three appendices, bibliography, and index complete this most informative volume about monks, canons, and friars and all that pertained to them in late medieval England.

JOSEPH H. DAHMUS
Pennsylvania State University.

Autobiography of Peter Cartwright.
New York, Abingdon Press, 1956,
349 pp.

One would like to applaud the publication of a "centennial edition" of this famous work, long out of print. Unfortunately, this new edition does not call forth much applause. It is good to have the work available. An index facilitates use. But that is all.

One yearns for a definitive introduction, giving the history of the manuscript as well as of the man. One looks in vain for helpful guidance in footnotes. One misses reference anywhere to the central position of W. P. Strickland, the original editor. Obviously one cannot demand all the paraphernalia of scholarship in a book designed for the general public. But may we not call for serious thought on the publication of definitive editions of the rich original sources of American church history—autobiography, journal, diary—of which this by Cartwright is the most famous, although by no means the most important?

FREDERICK A. NORWOOD
Garrett Biblical Institute.

MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

The Council met April 20, 1956 at the School of Religion, Vanderbilt University, with the following members present: Frederick A. Norwood, H. Shelton Smith, L. J. Trinterud, Winthrop S. Hudson.

The following persons were elected members of the Society, subject to the constitutional provision: Robert L. Balley, Carl Bangs, Ernest Cassara, A. Mervyn Davies, Henry Jackson Forstman, Olan L. Hicks, William Ingram, Kenneth L. Janzen, John N. Keller, Arthur Leggett, Richard D. Leonard, Carl W. McGeehon, Martin Marty, Charles M. Nielsen, Herman A. Norton, Henri R. Percy, C. P. Roland, Henry K. Shaw, Alton C. Trivette, James A. Thomson, Miss Ruth H. Whitford, Robert C. Wiederaenders, Wilfred Winget, Harold F. Worthley, Miss Eva J. Wrather, J. K. Zeman.

An invitation to hold the 1959 Spring Meeting at Southeastern Baptist Seminary, Wake Forest, N. C., was accepted. The committee on program and local arrangements for this meeting was appointed: Thomas A. Schafer, chairman, Pope Duncan, Roland Frye, Willis B. Glover.

The program for the meeting of the Society consisted of a series of four papers by William Haller on the topic: "The Elect Nation."

Attest: Winthrop S. Hudson, Secretary

